

LP
F

5012

1869

E2

“THE COLLEGE QUESTION.”

BEING THE DEBATE

IN

The Legislative Assembly of Ontario,

ON DECEMBER 2ND, 1868,

ON

“THE OUTLYING COLLEGES,”

AND

“SECTARIAN GRANTS.”

REPORTED BY J. K. EDWARDS.

RESOLUTION.

MOVED BY MR. CLARKE, MEMBER FOR GRENVILLE.

SECONDED BY MR. FRASER, MEMBER FOR NORTHUMBERLAND.

“That in the opinion of this House it is necessary and expedient, in the interest of Collegiate Education, that some comprehensive scheme be devised and adopted for giving effect to the objects, and for extending the operation of the Act 16 Vict., cap. 89, in the establishment of a Provincial University, and the affiliation of colleges to be supported in connection therewith.”

TORONTO :

PRINTED FOR THE PUBLISHERS,

BY THE DAILY TELEGRAPH PRINTING HOUSE, CORNER BAY AND KING STREETS.

ROBERTSON AND COOK, PROPRIETORS.

1869.

L
F5012
1869E2

THE COLLEGE QUESTION.

MR. CLARKE'S SPEECH.

Mr. CLARKE rose to move the following resolution :

“That in the opinion of this House, it is necessary and expedient in the interest of Collegiate Education, that some comprehensive scheme be devised and adopted for giving effect to the objects, and for extending the operation of the Act 16 Vic. cap. 89, in the establishment of a Provincial University, and the affiliation of Colleges to be supported in connection therewith.”

In doing so, the honorable gentleman said he thought that in proposing to the House the adoption of this resolution, he was infringing no rule of Parliamentary procedure. It was undoubtedly a well recognized principle that it was not competent for Parliament without a message of recommendation from the Crown, to pass any vote under which the public money might be appropriated or expended. That rule was clearly laid down in the high authority on Parliament Government, which was cited on a recent occasion by his honorable friend the Attorney-General. But while the rule was very clearly established, the exception to it was not the less clearly established, namely, that it was in the undoubted power of Parliament to tender its advice to the Crown upon any public questions whatever, and by its resolution to affirm as an abstract proposition the expediency of any public measure, although to carry out such measure it might be necessary to expend the public money. The vote itself did not provide for the expenditure of public money. The vote simply affirmed the desirability of a particular measure and if the Crown adopted the advice of Parliament, it might choose such ways and means for carrying out the measure as to its responsible advisers seemed expedient. Indeed to adopt any other rule than this would be to reduce the Legislature to the condition of a very subordinate and powerless part of Governmental machinery. To say that in everything involving expenditure they should propose nothing,

initiate nothing, and that their functions should be limited to merely endorsing the recommendations of the Crown, would be to say that they should be reduced to a position of practical insignificance which the representatives of the people in this country would scarcely care to occupy. The resolution being in order, he would mention briefly the reasons which induced him and those who agreed with him to bring the matter to the notice of the House. In asking the House to adopt the resolution, the intention was to initiate a movement which had for its object the improvement of our educational system, which they believed to be at present an imperfect and incomplete system, in so far as concerned that important part of it, the institutions for imparting collegiate instruction. It would scarcely be necessary for him to say anything as to the necessity, in a national point of view, of encouraging the educational establishments of the country, or of promoting their efficiency. He thought there was scarcely any honorable gentlemen who would choose to say that this was not one of the most important of their parliamentary duties. It would scarcely do for any Legislature in this 19th century, to declare that it did not recognize the necessity of keeping pace with the advancement of the age as regards the promotion of education, at a time when it was daily declared to us that nearly all the degradation, want of freedom and wretchedness which prevailed among the subject populations of the old world was traceable, directly or indirectly, to the unenlightened condition of the people. Surely, with this cry wringing in our ears, it was not the time to stop short and say that in this country we should do no more for the cause of the education of the masses. But he had heard it said that the education of the masses was one thing, and collegiate education was another. Some said let the wealthy who desire collegiate education pay for it. "Let us aid," they said "the humble scholar in acquiring an ordinary education, and if he wishes to acquire more than that, let him pay for it himself," or what was the same thing to him, let him do without it. Those who took that view of the matter would just open the book of knowledge to the student and when he had learned enough to give him a desire to learn more, would close it to him altogether. But it was not in the interests of the wealthy that any system of national instruction was established. The wealthy could always educate themselves. It was in order that poverty should be no bar to intellectual progress—in order that where the aptitude for learning existed, there should spring up men sympathizing with and carrying with them the sympathies of the people, who would be qualified to take part in public affairs and in the more prominent avocations and pursuits of the country. If then it was desirable that the class of institutions referred to in the resolution should receive national support, we should see what had been done by us in this direction. We had a common school system, which he believed was rendering great and important services to the country; a grammar school system imperfect perhaps in its details, but still very bene-

ficial in its operation. We had Upper Canada College, a useful institution, but still scarcely a part of any system, and then our fine Provincial University. When he spoke of the University, he wished it to be understood that neither he nor any other of the honorable gentlemen who had agreed with him in this matter, had the least intention of trenching upon the endowment, the rank or the privileges of the University. The present scheme was a building up, a constructive, not a levelling measure. For his own part, he cherished as much regard and admiration for that institution as its warmest friends did. He hoped, then, that this declaration made in all sincerity would satisfy those who were apprehensive for the University; that the present proposal was no measure of spoliation, but what it professed to be one for the further development of our educational system. But between the University and the rest of our national educational institutions, there existed a great chasm. Between the University on the one hand supplying the very highest kind of instruction, and our common and grammar school systems on the other, which supplied a kind of instruction peculiar to them, there was a want which had hitherto been in a great measure supplied by what was known as the Denominational Colleges. It would scarcely be contended that every student who wished to acquire a collegiate education should come to Toronto for the purpose. He did not think the capacities of the University and Upper Canada College would admit of it, and even if they did, the considerations of expense would preclude by far the greater number. He did not think either that it was advisable that our entire collegiate system should be centralized in one locality. The example of other countries showed that, at all events, there it had not been considered desirable. When we looked at England and saw such places as Eaton and Harrow and Rugby; and at Germany, and saw such places as Heidelberg and Bonn, and when we see such a large number of Colleges situate in small towns in the United States, we must perceive that in those countries it had not been deemed desirable to concentrate the academic system in the great centres of population. He thought that such a system, to be enjoyed by the whole country, ought to be diffused over the whole country. It would then be more accessible to the whole country, its benefits would be more generally felt, it would become cheaper; the money expended in maintaining it benefitted more the whole country, and it was quite consistent with that diffusion of the system that there should be a centre to it, in the shape of a University, which would form the capital of the whole edifice. It was evidently with some such object as this in view that Parliament, in 1858, passed the Act referred to in the resolution—the statute 16 Vic., chap. 89—known as the University Act of 1853. That, by sections 1 and 2, provided that there should be a corporation known as the University of Toronto. By section 3, that in effect that body should be an examining and not a teaching body. By section 4, that its board should be composed of the Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor, and the

members of the Senate nominated by the Government. It was provided by the 25th section that the benefits of the University and the privilege obtaining its degrees, should be extended to the graduates of other Colleges, and by section 26, those Colleges were declared to be the chartered collegiate institutions of the Province, which should affiliate with the University. By section 30, it was provided that the regulations of the senate, with respect to the literary and scientific attainment of persons obtaining degrees, and their examinations should, as far as circumstances would admit, be similar to those in force in the University of London. The plan of the University of London was well known. It consisted of a corporation which exercised the power of examining pupils in certain prescribed branches of study, and conferring degrees, honors and scholarships. The pupils examined received no part of their instruction from the University, but in different Colleges lying in different parts of the country, and affiliated with the University. The Act then went on in sections, from 39 to 54, to establish and define the functions of University College. University College was to be a body quite distinct from the University, and of quite a different character. University College was to be a teaching body, a first-class College, handsomely endowed, but having a separate organization, and in no way connected with the University beyond what other Colleges might be, having the privilege of sending its students to the University and obtaining its degrees, just as other affiliated Colleges should have. As regards endowment, the House was aware that at an early period an appropriation was made of a quantity of the waste lands of the Crown for the advancement of academic instruction. By this Act the endowment was to provide two funds, to be called respectively the income fund and the permanent fund. The income fund was to be composed of all the interest on sales of land, sold and not paid for, and of the interest on all moneys invested; and the permanent fund was to be composed of the purchase money of land sold, and of the principal of money invested. By the 78th section, the income fund was to be devoted (after paying charges of management) firstly to defraying the expenses of the University; secondly, to defraying the expenses of University College; and by the 81st section, the surplus of the income fund was to be appropriated by Parliament from time to time to the advancement of academical education in Upper Canada. The permanent fund was to be kept intact, to produce a revenue in future years, excepting a part of it should be required for purposes of improvement. From this short review of the Act, it would appear that in addition to the object previously referred to, there had been in view as regards the endowment, three other objects; namely, to sustain the University, to sustain the University College, and, afterwards, so far as the income fund would allow, to sustain the other academic institutions of the country. Two of those objects had been attained. The two institutions at Toronto had been amply supported, but as regards the last objects, the Act failed altogether. At the time the

Act was passed, in 1853, there was an excess of revenue over the expenditure of the Toronto establishments of \$12,138 from the income fund, so that the legislature very naturally supposed that about that sum would in each year be at the disposal of Parliament wherewith to aid the other Colleges. But since about 1857, in consequence of the expensive buildings put up for the use of the University, not only had the income fund been all expended, but it had been found necessary to trench very largely on the permanent fund. It was no part of his object to enquire how far this was judicious, nor how far it was legal to encroach upon the permanent fund. He wished merely to point out to the House that the other collegiate institutions, so far from receiving any aid from the income fund, had seen the permanent fund, the *corpus* of the endowment itself, very considerably diminished. The question might be asked why was it that the outlying Colleges did not affiliate with the University. The answer to that was, that the defective character of the Act was not calculated to secure that object. The Act made no certain provision for any of the Colleges. They were only to have such portions of the income fund as the University and the University College chose to leave, and as they chose to leave nothing, there was no inducement for the Colleges to affiliate. In the next place, the constitution of the Senate was unfavorable to the affiliation. Under the Act, the members of the Senate were nominated by the Crown, and the affiliated Colleges had no right as such to be represented in the Senate. A few of the professors in outlying Colleges were appointed to Senatorships, but as a general thing the Senate was controlled by gentlemen interested in University College. Consequently the other Colleges, finding that they would have no weight or influence in the board of the University, and practically speaking, would have nothing to do with its management, refused to affiliate at all. Now, if those were the objects of the Act of 1853, and if they had been frustrated by the defective nature of the Act itself, he was proposing to the House no novelty when he said that we should make better provision for carrying out the intentions of that Act. We found a certain purpose declared on our statute book, and it was now proposed that that purpose should now be carried out by some more effectual provision than that which now exists. The scheme which was foreshadowed in the resolution before the House, and which it was believed would answer the purpose, was a scheme for the promotion of academical instruction so comprehensive and provincial in its character that it should meet with general approval, and the basis of which was an affiliation of the local colleges with the university. In order to show that such a measure would meet with general approval, he would refer to the views of some of the public men, whose opinions were entitled to great weight. In 1861 there was issued a commission to enquire into the working of the University of Toronto. The commissioners were the Hon. James Patton, (then the vice-chancellor of the

University,) Dr. Beatty, of Cobourg, and Mr. John Patton, of Kingston. The report presented by those gentlemen was very valuable, and he would now refer to it. Under the head of suggestions, it was recommended that the Senate be reconstituted and consist of a fixed number, namely, the heads of the colleges, one member from each affiliated college, elected by its members, and the remaining third appointed by the Government; that the name be changed to the University of Upper Canada, and that the Senate should establish a common curriculum of education. It would be seen, also, by this report, that the authorities of the University themselves were in favour of some such measure as this. In answer to the inquiries of the commissioners, the Senate said, "that it was desirable that there should be one University Board for Upper Canada, to be designated the University of Upper Canada, to which certain Colleges should be affiliated." The same views were expressed by the Principal of Queen's College, the Principal of Victoria College, the President of Regiopolis College, and nearly the same views by the Provost of Trinity College. Those were the opinions expressed on behalf both of the University and the colleges, and also by the commissioners appointed to examine specially into the matter. And as regards the opinions of the people at large, he ventured to say that these views would be endorsed not only by a majority, but a very large majority indeed of the people of Ontario. The numerous petitions presented to this House, now amounting to several hundreds, and the character of the individuals signing those petitions, ought to be sufficient to convince this House that the great mass of the people of this Province were in favour of the promotion of higher education by some such measure as this. Who were the people signing those petitions? Take them in a religious point of view, and they were of nearly all the numerous bodies of Christians in the country. Take them in a social point of view, and they embraced all classes, from the judge on the bench down to the laborer. And looked at politically, we found on the one hand the Premier of the Dominion representing one class of opinions, and, as for the other, he (Mr. Clarke) had the honour of presenting a favorable petition a few days ago to which was appended the signature of a gentleman who was chairman of a great convention which met in Toronto last year, to settle the fate of the nation. It should be remembered that while the objects of the Act of 1853, so far as the outlying colleges were concerned, was defeated, those institutions enjoyed some compensation for their loss in the shape of small annual grants from Parliament. During the last Session the Lieut.-Governor, in a message to this House, declared the inexpediency of continuing those grants in the future. It was not sought now to re-open that question. Although, under the practice of grants, the injustice done to any one was infinitesimally small, yet, theoretically, the practice was open to objection, for it proceeded upon no logical or symmetrical plan. It was his intention, at the beginning of this Session, to urge the advisability of affording a temporary aid to the

colleges until something more efficient was substituted for the grant system, but on the advice of some honorable members on both sides of the house, it had been deemed best to strike at the root of the evil at once, and to propose an entirely new scheme for the advancement of academic instruction. It should scarcely be required of him to indicate precisely what the details of such a scheme would be. It would be for His Excellency's government, if the resolution were passed, to devise the best ways and means for attaining the object which was had in view. Let the government bring down their own scheme on the subject, and if it should be a comprehensive and liberal scheme they might rely upon his humble endeavors to aid in making it law. But in case it might be said that the present proposal was rather indefinite he would suggest that the mere outline of such a scheme as this:—Let there be established a new university board, composed of the boards of the colleges, the representatives of the colleges an equal number of gentlemen appointed by the government. Let this board establish a common *curriculum* of education for all the affiliated colleges. Let every college requiring affiliation be prepared with a fixed amount of capital not less than a certain sum, and let no college be entitled to affiliation or government aid unless its capital came up to the prescribed amount, and let each of those colleges attain a certain standard by maintaining a certain number of chairs of instruction, and adopting the common curriculum prescribed by the University. Let the governmental aid be either an equal amount to each college, or be based upon the capital subscribed, or the amount of work done, or some equally impartial system; and let each of those colleges be a teaching body qualifying its students for the taking of degrees in the University, and let the examination be before the board of examiners of the University according to the course of examination laid down by the board. According to this plan a young man would enter himself at whatever college in the country might suit him best. He would there get his instruction and when able to take his degree he would get that degree from the University, which should be called the University of Ontario, and which would give him a scholastic rank which no merely local institution could give. He did not say that he would press the adoption of precisely this scheme, but he said that this or a somewhat similar scheme would meet with very general approval throughout the country. And he said furthermore that to inaugurate and carry out such a system as this would be worthy of the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, would be worthy of a statesman, and would entitle him to the lasting gratitude of all those interested in the advancement of education. It might be fairly asked, would you allow what is called the denominational colleges, that is the colleges outside of Toronto to come in under this system. To that he answered that if he found a College, either already established or hereafter to be established, which complied with all the conditions of this scheme which affiliated with the University, adopted the *curriculum*, maintained an

efficient staff of professors for teaching the arts and sciences, subscribed the money, submitted itself to Government control and inspection, and satisfied us that every dollar of Government aid was expended in paying the professors in the arts and sciences, if, in short, it were shown that it was a national school, without any religious test, he would not exclude it from those benefits, merely because there was in connection with it a school for theological training. The Colleges which it was proposed to aid should be national Colleges, of a purely unsectarian character. But if he found located beside one of these, for the purpose of convenience, a school of divinity which the student may or may not attend, just as he pleases, which some attend and which some do not, he would no more withhold the aid on that ground than if the other school were one of law, of medicine, or of agriculture. His own opinion was that this outcry against the Colleges had arisen from a mistaken idea of the case. His opinion was that it originated altogether in the connection formerly subsisting between Upper and Lower Canada. Under that connection a portion of the public money had been annually given for the support of institutions in Lower Canada of such a strictly ecclesiastical character that the expenditure did not meet with favor in Upper Canada, and now, long after the real reason for it had ceased, the cry had been kept up for a totally different purpose. It was well known that the public opinion of the large cities always exercised a good deal of influence in the country. Now he hoped he was not exciting the hostility of his honorable friend the Provincial Secretary, in saying that when he saw that the Toronto press never had an encouraging word, scarcely ever a civil word, for any educational establishment outside of Toronto; when we saw them divided on every other subject, always agreed upon this, it was rather difficult to avoid the conclusion that it was the interests of Toronto they considered, and not the interests of the whole country. He had also heard it argued that every religious body in the whole country should support its own College. Now, if he was called upon to illustrate an *ad captandum* argument he could not adduce a better instance than this. It sounded very smartly, but contained very little sense. Supposing that every man educated his own family; supposing that every little community supported its own asylum, its hospital and other public establishments, he apprehended there would be but little need of a central government and legislature. It should be remembered, however, that there were certain undertakings of such magnitude and difficulty that they could only be accomplished by the combined efforts of the entire community, and one of those things was superior education. If you wished the people of the different religious denominations in the country to draw further and further from each other; if you wished them to become more and more denominational and more exclusive, then force them into separate Colleges, separate organizations and associations of every description, but if you wished to draw them nearer to each other, if you wished to soothe the asperities which arose from

differences of religious belief, then give them one more object in common with what they have now. Give them a common field of action in which those among them who are interested in higher education might co-operate together, and he promised, that in that field there would be buried a large part if not the whole of any remaining ill-feeling between religious sects in Ontario. He would conclude after offering one or two more observations. In a debate on the estimates last year, the hon. member from Welland had stated that the State of New York, every year, devoted a very large sum to the support of collegiate education throughout the State. He did not remember the amount, and would thank the member for Welland to mention it again, but it was very large, indeed. In view of this, he asked, was it not a pitiful thing that the magnificent Province of Ontario, with its surplus revenue of nearly a million of dollars, could not afford to spend, in the cause of collegiate education, one single dollar? But some one might say that because the public treasury was full he wished to deplete it, to carry out some fanciful scheme. To that he would answer no; that the policy of aiding superior education had been already declared and adopted, and he now only proposed that the policy should not be abandoned at a time when there existed no financial necessity for it. They might dispute the wisdom of the policy, but they could not dispute the absence of necessity. The first part of the proposition was open to argument; but the second was unassailable. He did not know what view would be taken of this matter by his honorable friends on the Treasury benches who now enjoyed, and he hoped might long enjoy, the confidence of this House. If their opinions on the subject were hostile opinions, all he asked of them was, that they would allow the House freely to come to a just conclusion on this matter. If the opinion of the House should be adverse to him, he would accept it as a settlement of the question for the present time, but for no longer; of the ultimate adoption of those views he had no doubt. If, on the contrary, the House agreed with him, he asked of ministers to give their earliest attention and their best energies to the settlement of this important question. Under the management of his honorable friends, with the support of this Legislature, the public affairs of this country for the past year and a half had been managed with great regard to economy, and, he would add, with a marked degree of ability. The people had seen the success which had attended the efforts of a frugal management of their affairs and his honorable friends now reaped the reward of their exertions in the confidence of Parliament and the approbation of the country. But in approaching this question of providing for the support of education, he would express an opinion that any Legislature or any Government which, relying solely on the public desire for economy, should forget that they are at the same time a liberal people and a generous people, would go very far indeed towards misunderstanding the true character of the people of this country. (Cheers.)

MR. FRASER'S SPEECH.

MR. FRASER said :—I have listened with feelings of no ordinary satisfaction to the address of the honorable member for Grenville, and if I now venture to present my own views, somewhat crudely to the House, I trust my friends will give me credit for sincerity, although on this occasion I do not expect that any large number of those with whom, generally, I have the pleasure of acting, will coincide with me in opinion. For years, the subject under discussion has been to me one of special interest, and I have come to the deliberate conviction, that it would subserve the interests of a greater number, and in so far the educational interest of the whole people, if some well digested and comprehensive measure were introduced, which, without crippling the energies of the University College, should so aid other kindred institutions that a large band of youth might annually proceed from our halls of learning, fitted by the mental culture and training to which they had there been subjected for the exigencies of life. Our common aim is to further, as best we may, the educational progress of this Province, and our only difficulty is in the mode adopted to carry out this common design. I hold it to be the first duty of a State to provide all its people with the facilities of acquiring that measure of education which fits them for any position to which their natural talents or circumstances call them, and in my judgment, no expenditure in public monies is so entirely unexceptionable, as that which provides for the educational necessities of the people. And when we have it on the authority of the Department of Education that no less a sum than a million and a-half (\$1,483,182) in addition to the Legislative grant, was last year contributed voluntarily by this Province, I think it fair to assume that a judicious expenditure of public funds for higher education would be sanctioned by the good sense of our constituents. We come now to the question as to the best mode of carrying out these views. I reply, first, by a *plurality of Colleges*. I am opposed to all monopolies, and I know of no special reason why this metropolitan city should enjoy a monopoly of the higher education of our people. I believe that the existence, not on a precarious but on a permanent and effective footing of other Colleges, would do much to excite a healthy emulation ; and whilst a majority of our future graduates will receive their instruction here from the distinguished men who now occupy the chairs of University College, and from their successors, I should be sorry to think that this Province will not yet have cause to be proud of men who look to some of the

other Colleges of Ontario as their *Alma Mater*. Let it be remembered, too, that some of these Colleges are anterior in their history to University College, and although they have not had the good fortune to fall heir to so goodly an inheritance, they took their rise at a time, when there was, properly speaking, no University in this Province, into the chairs of which other than the strictest Shibboleth could gain for a man admittance ; and under many disadvantages and with restricted means, they have manfully done their part in promoting the interest of higher education. I now come to face the question, whether Institutions in Ontario, hitherto controlled by certain religious denominations, should find that fact an insuperable bar to their reception of public aid ? (Hear, hear.) I presume it is not inadmissible for a man to hold an ideal and still accept conditions lower than that ideal, as the best practical settlement of a confessedly difficult question ? I am free to confess that my ideal in this matter, would be the permanent establishment of certain Local Colleges, on a non-sectarian basis, whose students, when wishing degrees would go up to one central University, and there entering into competition with their fellows, secure the high honor which I trust, will always be attached to a Canadian degree. But if the local Colleges enjoying the confidence of certain religious denominations, and, on that account specially cherished by a section of our people, are willing to come under a common curriculum, to prepare their students in arts for a common examination, and to give every guarantee by submitting to Governmental inspection for the efficiency of the education imparted ; then I am not prepared to say that it would not be a proper appropriation of public monies, to aid the cause of public education through these institutions, by the payment of the salaries of certain professors in arts whose nomination might rest with the Government, or by the erection of Collegiate Buildings. What I desire is the greatest good to the greatest number—and I feel assured that by utilizing the activities of denominational effort, without compromise of principle, and by recognizing the settled convictions of a portion of our people, who by their persistent sustenance of these Colleges, seem to me to declare their continued preference for them—the interests of the whole community will be subserved. Honorable gentlemen say, why ask us for aid to any extent in support of Colleges, which may be considered under the wing of a denomination to which we do not belong, but they forget that the whole community is not of their way of thinking, and that those who prefer not to use University College, have a claim on the consideration of the Legislature in the disposal of a portion of that aid which the people of Ontario are willing to extend to higher education. No one desires the recognition, by the State, of churches as such, nor aid for the purpose of furthering distinctive theological education. By common consent that is now recognized as the special province of religious communities, and the aid, which in my opinion could consistently be tendered by Legislative enactment, must be confined to the endowment of

special chairs in the Faculty of Arts—to the providing of suitable buildings, or other unobjectionable modes of assistance. It is claimed by some of my honorable friends, that by confining ourselves to University College and frowning down any project for the assistance of others, we secure perfect harmony in the community. Were it so, it would go far to convince me of the propriety of their course, but I have no such expectation, and one reason why I desire that the House should take this whole subject into its careful and candid consideration is the conviction I entertain, that the stifling of discussion now, is sure to be followed by an agitation over the land, of which the end is not yet. It is futile to ignore the religious activities of a people as these are evidenced by their denominational efforts, and despite all that has been said and written as to the danger of clerical influence in this behalf, I question whether some of the truest friends of intellectual freedom, of scientific research, and popular education, are not to be found within their ranks. Honorable gentlemen, for whose opinion I desire to entertain all due respect, appear to favor the idea that were the Government to initiate some such scheme, the country would lapse into primeval barbarism, or at least, into the undesirable condition which preceded the settlement of the Clergy Reserve controversy. I apprehend no such results. Here we have no dominant Church—in the eye of the law all men, and all persuasions, stand on a footing of perfect equality; and if any large number of our people attest their preference for institutions elsewhere than in this city, by partial endowment from their own means, and by sending their children there, it may be because the supervision exercised is to them satisfactory, or because the cost of education, and of living, is less than it possibly can be in a large city; then I think the Government would do well by aiding the “course of Arts” in such institutions, provided the standard of education proved to be equal to that furnished by University College, and men were furnished with all the requisites for securing by fair and honorable competition, the highest honors in the gift of the Provincial University. Holding these views, and believing that it would be in the interest of the whole people, that the denominational efforts in the cause of education should be brought into harmony with our national system, whilst with the Government would rest that authoritative system of inspection—on which alone a system of aid-giving could be founded—I cordially support the resolution which has been submitted. (Cheers.)

MR. CUMBERLAND'S SPEECH.

MR. CUMBERLAND said—I rise thus early in the debate to address the House upon this question, because, feeling that I can give a most cordial support to the resolution of my hon. friend from Grenville, I desire to avail of the earliest moment for putting myself, and those with whom I have the pleasure of acting, in a right position with reference to the criticisms to which we have already, and I think somewhat unfairly, been subjected in regard to the ground we take upon what has come to be called “the denominational question.” The whole subject embraced in the resolution of my hon. friend is one of such prime importance, and involves such grave interests, not only for to-day but for the whole future of this country, that any man who attempts to discuss it enters upon a high responsibility; and, if he has any fit sense of that responsibility,—with great fear lest he should do it injustice. (Hear, hear.) And let me first say that there is no public service in this country, which so completely commands the sympathy of the people, or so freely attracts its liberality, as that of education. The whole mind and heart and vigour of the people, seem to be, I won’t say concentrated upon, but at any rate most warmly directed towards this object. All are anxious and all ready to lend their aid and means towards correcting whatever may be wrong, and strengthening whatever may be weak in our great system of education. Thus we have recently acknowledged,—although it is some time since we made the discovery—that this great system of ours, however theoretically perfect, is in one particular at least, a failure. It is but a day or two since that a committee of this House came to the decision that at the very base of that system there is a failure; that in the cities and towns, if not elsewhere, it does not reach the idle, thriftless, vicious classes, the so-called arabs of the streets; that it does not attract or touch those, who, failing in any appreciation of education nay, who even stubbornly reject its advantages, are fit objects for the exercise of the coercive powers of the State, and a full justification for the adoption of a compulsory system. And if we are agreed that our existing system has been a comparative failure at its base, so, I am inclined to think, we shall come to agree that it has failed too at its summit; and it is with the summit—with the subject of the higher education—that we have to deal to-night. And here I would incidentally refer to what I believe to be the opinion of this

House and of the country, in relation to the Grammar Schools. There is a feeling abroad—and it has received recognition in this House—that the Grammar Schools are not doing the style and class of work that it would be fitting and to the advantage of the State that they should do. (Hear, hear.) There is an impression that the classical status which is made the basis of the public aid accorded to them, might be beneficially relaxed in favor of a more practical standard better fitted to the future objects and callings of the majority of the pupils attending them; and that by releasing these schools from their obligatory classical teaching to all alike, and supplying, in lieu of it, a higher teaching in those English branches which are of practical value in the future business of life, a great improvement would be effected. If these opinions be well grounded, and if there is, as I believe there is, a strong disposition in this House to act upon them, then it becomes more than ever important that we should well consider how the interests of higher education would be thereby affected: for, when we relieve the Grammar Schools of much, if not all, of the obligatory classical teaching, it will be our duty to supply that teaching somewhere else, and to make some compensation for that which may thus be taken away, (hear, hear,) for unless we are content to be “a nation of mediocrities,” we must keep open the channels to learning, in the higher sense of the term, and make provision for the proper education of the professional classes. (Hear, hear.) If I am right in this, then it is essential that we should strengthen and systematize our College and University establishments, and this, I take it, is the object of my honorable friend’s resolution, which invites us to devise some comprehensive scheme for giving a broader, and yet a more harmonious, operation to the Act 16 Vic., cap. 89, 1853. Now, under that Act, we have within this Province eight Colleges—and, if my information be correct, all of them exercising full University powers. I shall take the liberty of referring somewhat fully to the provisions of that enactment, because we are dealing not with a new question, but with one which has already been largely dealt with in our Statute Book, and because in any scheme now to be devised, we desire to make the existing law our starting point and ground of action. Let us glance back a little at this question and its growth. Time was, with reference to one of these Colleges—I mean King’s College—when it was a close corporation, belonging to one religious communion, closing its doors against all others, and availed of, and indeed available only, by the members of one Church. That monopoly, I am bold to say—and I wish to be clearly understood in saying—was wisely broken down, and upon its foundation was reconstructed, by Mr. Baldwin’s Act of 1849, another system, non-sectarian, thoroughly free and open, and secular. That Act, however, failed in its objects, and its failure is set forth in the preamble to the Act of 1853. I had not the advantage of being present when the honorable member for Grenville introduced his motion, but,

knowing how exhaustively he always deals with any question to which he may address himself, I must appeal to the courtesy of the House, if, in my desire to give full expression to my views, I intrude some details, already, perhaps, stated by my honorable friend. (Hear, hear.) Now, the failure of Mr. Baldwin's Act of 1849 is acknowledged by the Legislature of 1853, in the preamble to the Act of that Session, and in the following words:—

“Whereas the enactments hereinafter repealed have failed to effect the “end proposed by the Legislature in passing them, inasmuch”—and I beg the attention of the House to these words, “inasmuch as no College or “Educational Institution hath under them become affiliated with the University to which they relate, and many parents and others are deterred by “the expense and other causes, from sending the youth under their charge “to be educated in a large city, distant in many cases from their homes; “and whereas from these and other causes many do and will prosecute “their studies in other Institutions in various parts of this Province, to “whom it is just and right to afford facilities for obtaining those scholastic “honours and rewards which their diligence and proficiency may deserve, “and thereby to encourage them and others to persevere in the pursuits of “knowledge and sound learning; and whereas experience hath proved the “principles embodied in Her Majesty's Royal Charter to the University of “London, in England, to be well adapted for the attainment of the objects “aforesaid, and for removing the difficulties and objections hereinbefore “referred to; Be it therefore enacted, &c., &c.”

We see then, Mr. Speaker, that there is an acknowledgement in the Act of 1853 of a previous failure, and of the scope and manner of that failure: there is too a declaration that it is “just and right” to the people at large that that failure should be remedied; and that the way to remedy it was to adopt the system of the London University as a system well adapted for the attainment of the objects alike of the Act of 1849, and the subsequent Act of 1853. I apprehend we are all familiar with the system of the London University as being the establishment of one great central Examining University, surrounded by and connected with a number of outlying, and in many cases distant, teaching Colleges in direct affiliation with it. It was with the express view of reproducing this system in Ontario that the Act of 1853 was framed, and we find that its provisions were studiously intended to group all the then existing and rival Colleges in perfect equality of relationship towards one University, and to diffuse the advantages of Collegiate training over various parts of the Province, and yet under such unity of system as would secure one standard of education, one independent examining authority, and our source of University honors. (Hear, hear.) It was doubtless that the balance should be justly held as between all these Colleges and their respective undergraduates, that the Act distinctly prohibited any teaching in the University. “There shall,” it says, “be no professor-

“ships or other teacherships in the said University, but its functions shall be limited to the examining of candidates for degrees in the several Faculties, or for Scholarships, Prizes, or Certificates of Honor in the different branches of knowledge.” No language could more clearly express the jealousy with which the framers of this Act sought to place all the Colleges in equal relationship towards the University; and to guard the University as the central examining power from undue influence by any one of those Colleges: and that there might be no misapprehension of the broad liberality of the Act, we find it stated in another section that “In order to extend the benefits of Colleges and establishments already instituted in this Province, by connecting them for such purpose with the said University, all persons shall be admitted as candidates for the respective degrees as have in any of these institutions gone through and completed such course of instruction as the Chancellor and Senate may determine;” and the same section goes on to say that the institutions thus referred to are “all Colleges in Upper and Lower Canada, whether incorporated by Royal Charter or by Act of Parliament, and also such other institutions, corporate or unincorporate, as now are or shall hereafter be established for the purposes of education within this Province, which the Governor shall from time to time prescribe.” What possible language could have given the Act a broader or more liberal sphere of action, including as within the range of the University and as entitled to share in its advantages “all the Colleges,” and all the other educational institutions, meaning, of course, of the standard of a College, within the limits of Upper and Lower Canada, then united under one government and legislature. And as though to mark, word by word, and line by line, how strongly the legislature at that time desired to overspread the country with these institutions in affiliation with the one central University, the Act goes on to say that “the Chancellor and Senate may grant scholarships, prizes and rewards,” and that “such scholarships may be held, as University scholarships, in any of the affiliated institutions;” in other words, that the students of the Colleges at Cobourg, Kingston, Ottawa, or elsewhere, may hold scholarships from the University of Toronto, and thus practically participate in the wealth of its endowment. (Cheers.) And then, as though to protect the rights of the outlying Colleges to such a general participation, it proceeds to declare in the very next clause, that “the scholarships held by University College, prior to the passing of the Act, shall continue to be held as belonging to that College alone;” clearly showing that whilst with great propriety and justice the legislature guarded the then existing and exclusive rights of University College, it was determined, we now know how vainly, (Hear. hear), that all other and future scholarships, arising from increased endowment, or augmented income, should be free for distribution amongst all the Colleges throughout the country. We shall see presently how that provision has worked; first, however,

glancing at the measure of support intended by the Act to be given to these outlying and affiliated Colleges. And, first, the Act vests all the property and effects, real and personal, belonging to the University, in the Crown, in trust for Upper Canada College, University College, and the University of Toronto ; and then it provides that "any surplus of the " University Income Fund remaining, after defraying the expenses payable " out of the same, shall constitute a fund to be from time to time appropriated by Parliament for academical education in Upper Canada ;" that is to say, for distribution amongst "all the Colleges" to be affiliated under this Act with the central University. (Hear, hear.) Now, sir, unfortunately for those Colleges, this surplus has turned out to be illusory. In 1853, when Mr. Hincks, the then Premier, was framing this Act, he made official inquiry as to the probable income from this great endowment, and was told by the authorities of the University themselves that it would amount to \$80,000 a year ; and as the annual expenditure has been placed at \$45,000 a year, it is quite clear, that, at that time, the Premier, Mr. Hincks, the Government of which he was the chief, and the Legislature which adopted this enactment, were all acting in the belief that there would be a surplus of from \$30,000 to \$35,000 a year for "appropriation by Parliament for other academical ' education in Upper Canada," in fact for the outlying Colleges. Sir, I make no charges against any one of extravagance or misappropriation ; I deal simply with the facts as I find them, and, unfortunately, it does so happen, that, in the presence of the facts as they stand, we must dismiss this surplus from our minds ;—there is none, nor is there, I fear, a hope of any, seeing that the fund from which it was to have arisen is some \$70,000 in debt. (Hear, hear.) But I refer to this imaginary surplus now, in order to mark strongly what was the intent of this Act, and, in view of the intent, to mark what are the rights and claims of these Colleges upon us, seeing that the surplus which was offered to them in 1853 has vanished, and that they reasonably look for some compensating provision in its stead. (Hear, hear.) Sir, we need not search far for a solution, for when, in 1856, just three years after this Act was passed, the Legislature discovered that this surplus of some \$35,000 a year was illusory, it hastened to vindicate its pledges to these Colleges by embodying in the Grammar School Act of that Session a provision to the effect that "the sum of \$20,000 shall be yearly " appropriated out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of this Province for " the encouragement of superior education in Upper Canada, and shall be " distributed among the several Collegiate Institutions in Upper Canada," by annual vote of the Provincial Parliament. Now, mark the language, Mr. Speaker : the distribution is obligatory, for the Act says that \$20,000 "shall" be appropriated annually to the service we now designate as "the " higher education," the manner of the distribution only being reserved to the authority of a Parliamentary vote. Thus, sir, the first provision having

failed, by reason of the failure of an estimated surplus, the public faith was protected by a new enactment, which pledged the consolidated revenue of the Province to the fulfilment, or, at any rate, to the partial fulfilment, of the original promise. For fifteen years, then, the law of the land has recognized these Colleges as entitled to public support, and, over the whole of that period, has given practical effect to that recognition—during the first three years directing that a surplus, officially estimated at \$35,000 a year, should be distributed amongst them; and when that was discovered to have failed, by a specific appropriation, from the public revenues of \$20,000 a year, an appropriation, that, until now, has been punctually and systematically made by successive Parliaments. (Cheers.) Over the whole of that period these Colleges have gone on with their work under the full assurance that the good faith of the Legislature would not be broken. Sir, it remained for my honorable friend the leader of the Government to repudiate this liability, and by the fourth Enactment upon the Statute Book of Ontario, during the first Session of the first Parliament of this Province, when we were first exercising complete control over our internal affairs, and when even the poor excuse of poverty could not be given—for our Exchequer was overflowing—it was for him, and at such a time, to smite these Institutions with a remorseless blow, and to teach them and the country with what flippant indifference the faith of Parliament may be forfeited—(Cheers) it remained, I say, for my honorable friend, by a scratch of his pen, without inquiry or explanation, without offer of compromise or device of compensation, to wipe out provisions that had stood upon the Statute Book for fifteen years; and to say without warning, for twelve months is but a poor tenant's notice, that all public aid and recognition shall cease. Nor, Sir, was this all, for by an usurpation of Parliamentary power that, I fancy, is without precedent, my honorable friend not content with excluding these Colleges from his Supply Bill, told the House, and imprinted on the Statute, that in no future Session, by no future Parliament shall these grants to Colleges be repeated. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature that makes laws can unmake them; (Hear, hear.) Every shilling that was voted last Session by the Bill of Supply was illegal until that Bill was passed; and no Premier, no Government, has any authority to declare what Parliament in its wisdom shall or shall not do in the future; the Legislature is always free to do as it will, and were twenty Enactments on the Statute Book, such as we passed last year, yet are we as free as air to-day to make just such appropriations as we please to all such objects as we please, bound only by the responsibility we owe to the people. (Cheers.) The excuse for withholding these grants to the Colleges, was not, as I incidentally observed just now, that our Exchequer was impoverished, or that the Colleges were not doing their work. We were richer, or believed ourselves to be richer, when that Act of bad faith was perpetrated than we ever were before. But there was another, and I fancy it was the main

reason, underlying the action that we then took in this matter; we were afflicted with the remnants of a threadbare agitation bequeathed to us on the dissolution of our union with Lower Canada. In those old days it was thought necessary, to the protection of protestantism, that all sectarian grants should be objected to, and such a protest at such a time might possibly have found some justification. But to-day we are free of all outside influences; we have no partners; and the taxes that are levied from us are expended amongst ourselves and by our own authority; there is no danger of their being carried away to build up an ecclesiastical domination elsewhere; and surely, therefore, this is not the time to revive the effete howl of anti-sectarianism. Better far for us to take true measure of the circumstances in which we are placed, to take gauge of the wants and responsibilities of the day, apart from all the old party strifes with which three-fourths of this House have neither connection nor sympathy, and want nothing whatever to do; preferring to start upon a new political history, and free from the shackles by which the old politicians are bound hand and foot, to leave them to devote their abilities to the hard task of establishing their consistency, or of expressing their penitence for past errors. (Cheers and laughter.) I say, Mr. Speaker, that underlying that mighty dollar principle, which has so great an influence with the present advisers of the Crown in this Province, was this sectarian question. Now, I desire at once to repudiate for myself the idea of re-establishing sectarian grants. I was one of those, and there were not many in my church who took the same position, I was one of those, who, in Mr. Baldwin's time, approved of the measures which secularized the Clergy Reserves. I applauded, and had I then been in public life, I would have assisted in opening the doors of King's College to all denominations. To-day I support with all my heart the Common School system established in this Province. I am not going to be guilty of the inconsistency of harking back to an exploded system; but I hope I have the courage to face a false issue, and to do battle with it, however unpopular the duty, and I stamp this sectarian cry against the Colleges as a false issue. (Hear, hear.) I grant at once, so far as I am concerned, and so far as my approval of the objects contemplated by the resolution before us is concerned, that were a vote to be taken to-night for a repetition of the denominational grants, unconditionally and wholesale, as granted in the past, I would vote directly against them. Public monies should not, in my opinion, be appropriated for exclusive uses; wherever they are granted, the door should be wide open for all the people to share in the benefits of the expenditure, with such restrictions only as may be essential to the due administration of the funds. But what I assert and believe is this, that without receding from our opposition to sectarian grants, as such, it is possible, nay, easy, so to change the nature of these existing Institutions, and so to avail of the stability and permanence to which they have attained, as that, without sacrifice of the principle of non-

sectarianism, may uphold the good faith of the Legislature towards these Colleges, as pledged to them by the Acts of 1853 and 1856, to which I have already referred. (Hear, hear.) I say, sir, "without the sacrifice of the "principle of non-sectarianism," for there I stop, because I decline to join in a rabid warfare against everything religious. Religious bigotry and intolerance are hateful enough, but intolerance of all religion is simply abominable. (Cheers.) We enjoy religious liberty, full and complete; let us watch and guard it with the most jealous vigilance, but let us be careful lest, in our dread of ecclesiastical domination, and a distrust of our own strength to resist it, we be not guilty of the crime of oppressing everything religious. (Hear, hear.) And who will dare to say—is there any honorable member of this House who will take the responsibility of saying—that upon this question the heart and judgment and temper of the people is unsound. I warn honorable gentlemen, that if here, to-day, a new crusade is to be made against everything that has about it the savour of a Christian faith, the people will resent the outrage, and will teach Governments and Parliaments that the religious liberty of which we boast so much and so justly, shall be protected against this secular intolerance. (Cheers.) And will honorable gentlemen tell me that nothing but the annihilation of these Colleges will suffice to satisfy these secular prejudices; that it is impossible so to change their system as to satisfy the conditions of a non-sectarian grant? If they do so, I take them back to the history of University College, how it sprang out of, and was indeed the mere product of, its predecessor, King's College, which, as I have already said, was a close religious corporation, an ecclesiastical establishment, held and administered by one Church, to its own exclusive uses. And what have we to-day in University College? A purely secular Institution, upheld by the same endowment, surrounded by the same graduates, and administered, to a large extent, by the same Professors as had previously attached to King's. The change, as a change of principle, has been complete, but it has been attained, not by destruction and annihilation, but by the preservation and maintenance of whatever was good and promising, and available, in the original College. Some of the most distinguished Professors of King's, themselves Divines of the Episcopal Church of England, are now, by their labors, building up the reputation of University College. Surely that is in itself sufficient answer to the prejudice which would imply that it is impossible, with secular safety, to teach Latin and Greek by the hands of Divines? No one can say that the classical work of University College is not well and successfully directed by its distinguished President (the Rev. Dr. McCaul), and surely if, at University College, it be compatible with a non-sectarian system, with your secular prejudices, that Greek and Latin may be taught by an Episcopalian Divine, then, Episcopalian as I am, I ask why may they not as well be taught at Kingston by a Presbyterian, or at Cobourg by a Methodist Divine? (Cheers.)

Yes, whilst you have changed the very nature of King's College, you have in truth preserved it in the unbroken succession of University College ; you have done this by Statute, and have done it successfully ; and what has been done in the case of King's can just as easily and just as successfully be done in the cases of Queen's and Victoria. (Hear, hear.) But let us look a little further. I apprehend there can be no question as to the command which our Common School System exercises over the sympathies of the people, and yet will any man say that in connection with that system the administration of Divines is incompatible with the secular and nonsectarian character ? For what have we got here ? Why, on every official document, on every circular and book, issued from the Department of Public Instruction, we find a coat of arms, a device, a sort of official banner, with this legend inscribed upon it, "Religio, Scientia, Libertas :"—religion first, and liberty, even liberty, last. (Cheers.) Is this a sham, or a reality ? or have we indeed sunk so low that in the fever of our secular ambitions we can venture to mock at sacred things ? And who sends out this banner with religion inscribed upon it ? The Council of Public Instruction—a body charged with all the powers and responsibilities of administering our great system of non-sectarian education, and yet a body composed of ten members of whom eight are Divines. In this body we have in truth a grand and most imposing array of the clerical power of the Province—a Bishop, a Dean, an Archdeacon, and five Doctors of Divinity ! And yet will anyone assert that the people of this Province, from one end of it to the other, distrust this body, or condemn its administration of the great interests confided to it ? Hold up your hands high then in horror, you who are the opponents of this movement to utilize these Colleges, lest in regard to them, as to the Common Schools, the Clergy should hold place. (Cheers.) And who have we as the very head and front of this same secular system the Superintendent of Public Instruction ? Who, but the father and founder of the system, himself a Doctor of Divinity, a Minister and a Methodist. (Hear, hear.) So, too, if we proceed still further, we shall find that the Head Master of the Normal School is a Divine—the Inspectors and late Inspectors of Grammar Schools, all Clergymen—and that ten Grammar Schools supported by public grants are in the hands of ten Clerical Head Masters ; and will any one venture to say that these ten Schools are taught according to the Sectarian views of each Head Master ? Again, we have Clerical Chairmen of the County Boards by the dozen—whilst of 268 Local Superintendents, 140 are ordained ministers of religion. And as if this array were not enough to prove that a clerical executive is regarded as entirely consistent with a secular system, we find that the school law not only recognizes but appoints the clergy *en masse*, as official visitors of all schools. I confess, Mr. Speaker, that I was myself astonished when I came to see how largely this secular system availed of clerical administration ; and if, as I believe, that system in such hands is regarded as safe, and com-

mends itself to the approval of the great majority of the people, it is not, I conceive, open to any honorable gentleman to say that a similar administration of these Colleges by divines, but under statutory conditions, must necessarily be unsafe to the secular and non-sectarian system, or inconsistent with the whole structure of our educational establishments. (Hear, hear.) I repeat then that what was possible in regard to King's College; and what has been possible with our Grammar and Common Schools in secularizing the whole system, and yet availing without prejudice of whatever material was available, is just as possible and quite as easy with reference to the Colleges. They have all been constructed or changed by statute. They are all now subject to statute, and conditionally supported by grants from the public Treasury, as determined by statute. It is idle then to say that these Colleges may not also be directed and governed by statute, or that statutory conditions of aid would be less binding upon them than upon any other portion of our system of public instruction. (Hear, hear.) You object that these Colleges are sectarian institutions, upheld and maintained by religious organizations. Sir, I trust that you will have organized religion as long as the country lasts; nay more, I trust you will have sectarian organizations as long as the country lasts; for in these days the friction of sectarianism gives vitality to Christianity. (Cheers.) We cannot legislate these sects away; but we can utilize them in the work of education, and we can so amalgamate and fuse them in that work as to temper and moderate denominational feeling; to knock off the rough edges of sectarian bigotry and intolerance, so that in whatever College our young men may be educated, being gathered into one great central University they shall there meet on broad and common ground, and learn to yield whatever bitterness may attach to sectarian differences, and to cultivate the liberality which should belong to good citizens and patriots. (Hear, hear.) On the other hand, as has been well said by the Member for Leeds and Grenville, if you want to embitter and intensify Sectarianism, if you desire that the hand of one religious denomination shall be raised against another, if you are ambitious to beget bigotry and to nurse intolerance and strife, then you will reject these Colleges from your system, shut them out as lepers and Ishmaels, and insulting them by your contempt or your distrust you will rouse them to new vigor in a battle against that institution from which they are excluded, a battle all the more bitter and unrelenting because aroused by injustice and oppression. (Loud cheers.) Sir, for fifteen years, as I have said, these Colleges have been under the protection of the State, and have received a measure of public aid; and over that whole period if I am not mistaken, and I speak merely as a looker-on, over that whole period, never once were they met in the Legislature by a hostile vote, never once were these Colleges made the battle ground of party, nor the aid accorded to them opposed on a Sectarian issue; (Hear, hear,) nay more, one of them, and that with which I am naturally supposed to sym-
pa-

thize very closely, actually received its first grant at a time when on the formation of the Coalition Ministry of 1864, the leader the Reform party was in power.

But, Mr. Speaker, with this glance at the Act of 1853, its objects and promises and working, I must pass on to enquire how it has happened that these Colleges have failed to affiliate under its provisions with the University of Toronto. A very simple and palpable solution at once presents itself—every one of these Colleges being possessed of independent University powers, received aid from the State freely and without condition; what else then could be expected but that, being so aided, they would continue to exercise those powers and to maintain their separate existence and privileges as Universities. Continue these unconditional grants and you may be pretty sure that affiliation will never come; but make the grants conditional upon affiliation, and in all probability you will at once succeed. Another reason of the failure was that the Act of 1853 gave no security to such of the Colleges as should affiliate; for whilst of course they were required to suspend their University powers they were offered nothing in compensation. (Hear, hear.) The Constitution of the Senate was by nomination and favor of the Administration of the day—its number was unlimited, and the Colleges affiliating were secured in no right to a fair share, or indeed to any share, in the government of the University. This Senate, as now composed, has forty-nine members, of whom twenty-nine are residents of Toronto, twenty-four are directly connected with University College, and twenty are non-residents of Toronto. It is easy from this to see that the Professors and graduates of University College practically hold control of the Senate, and it is not, therefore, to be wondered at that the outlying Colleges hesitated to throw in their fortunes with an University whose governing body was really a representation of the one favored and highly endowed rival Institution; for, under such circumstances, it was scarcely possible, except by the greatest stretch of generosity, to believe that the interests of Ottawa, Kingston, Cobourg, and other places, would have any voice in the administration of the University. (Hear, hear.) Now, what does complete control of the University imply? But, before answering this question, I desire to say, that, in all my observations relating to University College, or the University of Toronto, my wish is to speak with the utmost possible respect of all those in authority in those Institutions, towards which I entertain feelings of strong and unflinching loyalty, altogether repudiating any intention to weaken either of them, to join in any act of spoliation in regard to them, or to fail in assistance to any measure calculated to give them future strength. Having thus, Mr. Speaker, fortified myself against misinterpretation, let me again ask: "What does complete control of the University by one College really imply?" Sir, it implies precisely the state of things which the Act of 1853 was intended to

prevent, and which an appeal in that Act to the precedent of the London University was intended to condemn and avoid ; for it points to the adoption of an University standard best adapted to the particular powers of that particular College, a trimming, in fact, of the University standard to suit itself. (Hear, hear.) Again, it means the appointment of the University Examiners, the appointment of those, in fact, who are to test the powers of the respective Colleges, and to dispense and distribute amongst the "alumni" the rewards and distinctions due to University success. (Hear, hear.) Now, what are the facts with reference to the Examiners of past years. Sir, I have the privilege of an intimate acquaintance—I may even venture to claim of friendship, with many of the distinguished men who are charged with the administration of University College, and I believe that, under the circumstance in which they were placed, they adopted the best, if not the only, possible course in regard to the Examiners ; but I know, also, that that course, unavoidable as it was, has often been most distasteful to themselves. What are the facts ? Why, that, taking the years 1866, '67, '68, we find seventy University Examiners appointed, of whom forty-nine, or seventy per cent., were in direct official connection with University College as Professors, Graduates, or otherwise (hear, hear) ; and that the appointment of these gentlemen has been continued year after year in unbroken succession for many years. I know there has been a lack of material. I am quite aware of a very strong desire in the Senate, as well as amongst the Examiners themselves, to effect frequent changes, were it possible. But, sir, the impossibility arises from the very absence of that affiliation which the evil itself postpones (hear, hear), and from a departure from the London University system of written papers distributed to all the Colleges, a system affording great scope and freedom in the choice of Examiners. (Hear, hear.) Following still further the effect of direct control by one College, we shall find, that, during the last three years, the University scholarships, amounting to something like \$12,000, found their way, I believe I am correct in saying, without the exception of a single dollar, into the pockets of scholars of University College. True, it may be said that has resulted from the absence of the other Colleges—that had they entered under the Act of '53, they would have shared in the Scholarships ; but, mark, if they had come in, they would, as I have just shown, have been under the control of a University College Senate, which may possibly have established a University College standard of examination, which has certainly appointed 70 per cent. of the Examiners from University College, and the result of all which has been an absolute monopoly of all the University scholarships by scholars of University College. (Hear, hear.) For all this, Mr. Speaker, the law rather than the University or the College is to be condemned ; and it is our business and duty now so to amend the law as to correct these palpable evils by the adoption of some comprehensive scheme, as proposed by the resolution of

my honorable friend. Let us consider well the existing condition of things : we have, as I observed at the outset, eight Colleges in Ontario in the full exercise of University powers ; that is, we have eight different independent, and possibly hostile, bodies engaged in the same work, but each after its own fashion, and, therefore, on eight different standards of a University course, but all granting Degrees, which, by sign and sound, but in nothing else, signify an equal rank in scholarship. (Loud cries of hear, hear.) Can any one say to-day what "M.A." really implies or assures in regard to scholarship amongst us ? Is it an acknowledged measure of value ? Is it a genuine stamp and passport amongst the learned ? I contend, sir, that the Legislature is answerable for this unhappy condition of things so long as it is permitted to continue, for the Legislature has granted the powers by which this miserable confusion has been created ; and the Legislature has contributed to the support of these colleges without dictating any conditions, without determining any standard upon which those powers should be exercised. (Hear, hear.) Sir, it would, in my humble judgment, be just as reasonable to brand every quality of metal with but one mark ; (hear, hear,) just as reasonable to apply "the Hall mark" to eight different qualities of gold without any assay of the material, for when these eight Colleges have stamped their men with the titles belonging to scholarship, you cannot for the life of you tell which is the true metal and which the Brummagem imitation. (Cheers.) Thus, the absence of affiliation and the continued exercise of University powers by these Colleges, has, as many believe, tended to the degradation of learning and of its honors ; for Colleges which teach would seem to be unsafe depositaries of those University powers which dictate the standard, test the merits, and dispense the rewards of scholarship. (Hear, hear.) Colleges, having University powers, are not very likely to pluck their own men ; nor are they very likely to be unduly jealous about the standard, for a high standard means hard work for professors as well as students ; and as a high standard also means comparatively small numbers, poverty is a sore temptation to bring them down, (hear, hear,) and it is because of this that whilst competition within a system, such as that of Oxford, or Cambridge, or London, tends to exalt the standard, competition outside of a system, such as amongst our eight Colleges of Ontario, tends under the pressure of poverty and the ambition for numbers, to depress and degrade the standard. The absence of affiliation is also the absence of that vigorous and wholesome competition which is the very soul and marrow of scholastic success. Now, the Act of 1853, as I have already shewn, provided for this competition or rather intended to produce it when it declared that the University scholarships might be held by all the Colleges in Upper Canada and when it declared that the University should be an examining and not a teaching institution. Time was when King's College, and afterwards University College itself, exercised University functions, but the Legislature

withdrew those functions, and most wisely, in order that the examining and rewarding power should be severed from the influences of the teacher, and that the University should stand in equal and independent relation to all the Colleges. But as the Senate is now composed, as the University is now administered, those intentions have been practically frustrated, for in all the details and influences and results of administration University College and the Toronto University are again to all intents and purposes but one institution. (Hear, hear.) Standing together, but isolated and alone, living as it were only for each other, grand and perfect as they are, and administered as they are by a body of men as distinguished as can be found in any but Imperial institutions, there is a danger, and it is a danger attaching to all wealthy monopolies, that deprived of the friction of competition they may degenerate into slothful inactivity and go to sleep by the way. (Hear, hear.) And certainly, Mr. Speaker, if you persist in annulling these grants, and by impoverishing the Colleges exclude them in perpetuity from all competition for this great endowment, you will contribute to that result, for by leaving these seven other Colleges and Universities in impoverished independence they will almost of necessity have to make up in numbers what they lack in means, and the standard of Scholarship will thus inevitably and permanently be further degraded, until learning itself may cease to be esteemed. (Cheers.) Compare such loose and disjointed efforts with the system prevailing in England and Ireland, look at the competition there, look at the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and London, and at the Queen's University of Ireland, with the groups of Colleges gathered around each, and where every College has its standard bearers who strive not more for personal distinction than for the honor of their College, and then say whether this noble rivalry this honorable emulation is not the key and secret of the success that has been achieved. Why, then, should we not adopt a similar system, the system in fact aimed at by the Act of '53? And if the outlying Colleges were admitted or tempted, or if need be were coerced into affiliation with the one, and but one, central University of Toronto who would suffer? Surely not University College, for with her splendid endowment and the extraordinary advantages it secures to her, in a professorial staff of the highest distinction and of most ample number; in all the aids and appliances which wealth only can secure; and in a home which even I may humbly venture to suggest is very fitting, (Cheers), she surely cannot fear the competition of affiliation, for, unless I greatly overrate her powers, the affiliation of the other Colleges implies no danger but great addition to her prestige. And what other objections could she have? Is her greed so great that she desires to hold in an insatiate maw the endowment of the University as well as the endowment of the College? I believe not. I believe she is ready to do battle with all comers, and to vindicate by her success in the Schools her title to a full share of University honors and rewards. To suppose it possible that she desires to

hold to her own sole and exclusive uses the magnificent endowment of the University, participation in which belongs of right and by law to "all the Colleges," is to suppose that the history of King's College has been written in vain, and that she, like her predecessor, prefers to die the death of the selfish and solitary suicide rather than to admit others to her companionship, (Cheers,) it is to suppose that she has no dread of the future which such injustice would beget, no fear of that retributive justice which these impoverished institutions might combine to deal out. (Hear, hear.) Sir, I warn honorable gentlemen opposite, and those amongst them to whom University College and the Toronto University are especially and so justly dear, to whom the honor of those institutions is so precious, and who in their own successes so amply illustrate it, I warn them to be careful that they do not by their illiberality beget a unity of purpose amongst these outlying Colleges, well, amongst these sects if you prefer the expression, which instead of being as it now is an effort to promote the interests of higher education throughout the country by separate aid from general sources, shall, as a last and desperate resource, seek support directly out of the University and College endowments. (Cheers.) A result so dire would command my entire regret. I contemplate the bare possibility of it with the terror due to an unmixed evil, and let me most distinctly say it shall be free from any support of mine, (cheers); but such a proposition has been made before to-day, and may be made again. I would have hon. gentlemen look to it that by their action on the resolution of my hon. friend, they do not precipitate an issue that all true friends of a higher education, and of the University of Toronto, would lament and condemn. I claim, Mr. Speaker, that in the observations I have ventured to intrude upon the House, I have established two or three propositions. I claim to have established the fact that the Act of 1853 proposed to construct a system of Colleges affiliated with one central University; that it professed to offer, and indeed to secure to, those Colleges a measure of support by the distribution amongst them of a surplus revenue from the University Endowment; such surplus being estimated in 1853 at \$35,000 per annum. I claim too to have shown that when, in 1856, that surplus failed, the Legislature, recognizing the responsibility to compensate for that failure, declared by Statute that \$20,000 a year should be appropriated to those Colleges; and that such appropriations had been continued for twelve years, without opposition from any party in the country, without one single hostile vote over that long period; and I say, that under that condition of things, it was no less unwise than unjust to deprive them suddenly of that support, without any suggestion of compromise, or any effort to bring them into harmony with our secular system of public instruction. Sir, no one has contended that during the 15 years of their recognition, these Colleges were not doing good work; work worth the money, (hear, hear), they sent out many men who have subsequently occupied positions of

influence and honor, and great usefulness in this Province; and our own House bears testimony in some of its most valued members to the excellence of their teaching and discipline. (Hear, hear.) I am not in a position at this moment to quote the figures with exactness; but I am able to state generally, and from information before me, that three of these Colleges have sent out more men, more graduates, than the one great central endowed institution; and if a money value can be placed upon such work, we should remember that whilst those three Colleges have received aid to the extent of about \$12,000 a year, the expenditure from the University endowment has amounted to upward of \$45,000 a year. Speaking commercially, therefore, these Colleges have been producing a larger quantity of as good a commodity, but at a very much cheaper rate than the production of the University of Toronto, and although there may be some who attribute special value to a secular training, I apprehend there are not a few of our fellow subjects who attach great importance and a higher value to religious teaching and discipline, (hear, hear); and this brings us to consider practically how it may be possible to bring these institutions into one general system. Sir, I have already ventured to say that it is perfectly competent in us to devise a scheme which shall fuse the secular and sectarian principles in the future working of these Colleges; and that unless we do so, our great system of public instruction will be incomplete; sectarianism will be embittered, intensified and perpetuated and thus the seeds scattered broadcast, which shall ultimately destroy our whole existing organization. And if I say that it is possible to bring these Colleges into harmonious combination with our secular system, and to utilize them without sacrifice of the principles by which that system is governed, I feel that the House and the country have a right to ask "How?" My honorable friend from Grenville and myself have been charged with framing a cunning and ingenious resolution, which means more than it dares to express, which is intended to entrap the unwary into some deep sectarian conspiracy. (Laughter.) Well, sir, speaking for myself, I utterly repudiate any such charge—I am entirely innocent of any such intention. The resolution before the House means no more and no less than I mean in what I have said, and I think my honorable friend and myself have spoken very plainly. But, that there may be no mistake as to my objects, I am quite ready to take the House into my confidence, and however great the imprudence, to expose to it my own personal view as to how these changes may be brought about. In the matter of the Common and Grammar Schools, for instance, is not the secular safety which we attribute to them—is not the liberality with which we deal with them, and with which the people themselves deal with them, based upon the security given to them by statutory provisions? Is it impossible to do the same with these Colleges? is it impossible to surround them, to direct, guide and govern them by statutory enactment, as part and parcel of the same system—as the crowning

of the same system to which the Grammar and Common Schools belong? We humbly think not; we see no difficulty in legislating just as distinctly and rigidly, and to the same general results for the support and government of Colleges as for the support and government of Grammar Schools, and we fail to discover any reason for doubting that such legislation would be just as effective in the one case as in the other. (Hear, hear.) But, I am asked, how would I legislate? Well, sir, I would provide that all future aid to these Colleges should be conditional—and the conditions I would enforce might be somewhat of the following character:—First, that no theological tests should exist—that persons of all denominations should be admitted, and that the acceptance of any religious teaching or service shall be wholly voluntary and optional with the students or their parents. Second, that public aid shall be conditional upon the suspension of University powers in the Faculties of Arts, Law and Medicine—a full affiliation with the central University—the taking of all Degrees in Arts, Law and Medicine at that Institution, and, as a consequence, the adoption of one standard and curriculum by all the Colleges. Third, that whatever aid may be granted from the public exchequer shall be wholly, and in each year, expended in support of the Faculty of Arts, and for no other service whatever. And lastly, that the continuance of public aid shall depend upon the Colleges respectively contributing a certain minimum number of graduating students actually admitted to Degrees by the University; in other words, that the Colleges shall do a certain amount of successful work in each year, or forfeit the grant. Such conditions, I contend, Mr. Speaker, would secure the affiliation of these Institutions on a perfectly non-sectarian basis, and would secure all the advantages of one standard and of one central University. But it has been urged, over and over again, that if aid be given to one of these Institutions it must be given to all; and that, under such attraction, Colleges would be apt to crop up like mushrooms. (Hear, hear.) Sir, the objection was a good one so long as the grants were made unconditionally, but it loses all its force when you come to dictate affiliation, involving one standard of examination, a standard which in itself will oppose an obstacle to all experimentalism, and make real work the measure of public aid. (Hear, hear.) But, if this be doubted, how easy it would be to dictate such further conditions as might be necessary to protect the public exchequer from undue assault. For instance, it might be a condition precedent to such aid that the College should be in possession of suitable buildings, of certain extent and value, and free from all incumbrance; it might be a condition that the College should possess such a minimum endowment as would afford due assurance of its stability and teaching power; and, finally, perhaps the measure of public aid might in some degree be made to depend upon the measure of private endowment, applying the same principle to the Colleges as we have already applied to the Common and Grammar Schools.

for, as with them, the State contributes in exact proportion, dollar for dollar, as is provided from local sources by self-imposed taxation ; so, in regard to the Colleges, it might, within certain prescribed limits, grant aid in exact proportion, dollar for dollar, as is derivable from the particular endowment, or from other sources. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. Wood.—Would you make that apply to the present Colleges ?

Mr. Cumberland.—Certainly, for no College should live on public aid alone ; nay, no College should receive public aid unless its own resources were such as to warrant State assistance ; and certainly if the State assists them it has a perfect right to say upon what conditions such assistance shall be given. If, however, their teaching is upon so low a standard, if their poverty is so great as to impair their usefulness, if their bigotry is so intense as to reject the reasonable conditions essential to the interests of the public at large, then I for one would say “keep them out, it is their own doing.” (Hear, hear.) Such then, Mr. Speaker, is the scheme, or rather the general outline of a scheme, by which I am disposed to believe that these Colleges may be beneficially availed of in aid of the higher education of the country, without invasion of the non-sectarian principle upon which our whole system has been based, and without undue pressure upon the public Exchequer, or any increase to the grants which have been made to that object during the last fifteen years. Sir, I challenge honorable gentlemen to the argument, for mere impulse, or the temporary force of numbers will not settle this question, I ask them to recognise the great results that may be expected to flow from a wise comprehensive and liberal treatment of it. I invite them to consider how, by some such measure as I have ventured to indicate, the whole higher education of the Province now remitted to isolated and hostile hands and to discordant influences, may be reduced to one harmonious system, subjected to one direction and control, and concentrated upon one great centre—the University of Toronto as the one University for the whole Province. (Hear, hear.) And what a University would that then be. Gathering in to her fold all the graduates of all the Colleges, she would be honored, strengthened and protected by a body second in influence to none other in the country ; and fusing and subduing all the discordant elements of religious differences into one grand abiding place of learning and of religious liberty and toleration, she would fulfil her mission by giving to the country a succession of men who should make her famous to all posterity. (Cheers.) And now, sir, I have done ; I have already overtaxed the patience of the House, and have to offer my most grateful acknowledgements for the generous consideration it has extended to me. The importance of the question and the false issues which have been raised upon it must be my excuse. It is, as I think, a question which it would be well for us to remove from the arena of party, from the effete agitations of old party struggles ; proper enough perhaps in

their day when we had an outside partner to watch ; but worse than useless, stupid and almost wicked, now when we have no external jealousies to excite us. (Hear, hear.) Let us, then, justify the wisdom and liberality which has given us separate Legislative powers, by the calmness and moderation of our decisions, and in the interests of the country at large, let us unite in completing that grand system of education which now only awaits the cap-stone of a College and University organization to make it wholly worthy of the pride with which we are already disposed to regard it. (Loud cheers.)

MR. BEATTY'S SPEECH.

Mr. BEATTY said—When this question was under consideration last Session, and this House took the action they then took upon it, that, namely, of embodying in the Supply Bill a clause that no further aid should be given to collegiate institutions, it was expected that the Government would bring down some scheme which would supply the place of the system which they had by that clause destroyed ; that they would have provided some national basis for higher education ; that they would have endeavored to extend the system which already exists, with regard to the lower branches of education, so that the youth, not of any particular locality, but of the entire country, might be enabled to share in the advantages to be derived from a liberal education. (Hear, hear.) It was understood, however, before the House met at its present Session, and clearly understood, after the speech was read from the throne, that there was to be no such policy brought down ; and the country immediately was agitated—petitions were circulated both for and against—and the country is now agitated upon this question. It is in vain for us to shut our eyes to this fact. There is no doubt that a very serious agitation now exists in the country with regard to it, and I claim that it becomes the duty of this House seriously to look at this question. It becomes our duty to give an earnest attention to the prayer of these petitions. It becomes our duty to consider this whole question, and see what ought to

be done, in order to provide for the higher education of the youth of our country, as well as we provide for the common education. It is because no action had been taken in this direction, that the resolution, which was so ably moved, seconded, and supported this afternoon, has been brought in by my honorable friend from Grenville, in order to bring this matter before the House and the country, and that some action might be taken; and it is for the same reason that I now support it. I think something ought to be done. I believe that to leave the question in its present position—the State only giving support to one favored institution—is something the country will not submit to. And I believe that, when the scheme, which has been very ably presented to the House to-day, is fully and fairly presented to the country, it will be found that the country will be prepared to accept that scheme. (Hear, hear.) A great deal of misapprehension exists with regard to this question, on account of its being mixed up so much with this cry of “no connection between Church and State,”—a cry which has been put forth for the purpose of damaging the movement that is on foot. Now I cannot see what connection this has with the question of Church and State. If I understand the meaning of a connection between Church and State, it is the State giving aid to, and supporting the religion of a particular sect; and I can see no analogy between that and the State giving aid for secular education, though that education may, to some extent, be under the management of some denomination. I think it will be found, when this question is fully understood, that the question of a connection between Church and State has nothing at all to do with it. Then, too, the cry of sectarianism has been attempted to be raised, in order to damage this movement. Nor has this anything to do with the question at all. If we read the resolution, as put before the House to-day, we will see that it only proposes, in the interests of a national system of collegiate education, to extend the Act of 1853, in order that the Act may be more operative, and that it may meet the wants of the country with regard to higher education. And I am sure there is not an honorable gentleman here who would not be prepared to amend an Act, if he thought that Act should be amended; or who would not be prepared to extend an Act, if he thought that, by extending it, the country would be benefitted. This question has been very ably put before the House already, and I shall not, therefore, feel myself called upon to enter as largely into it as I might otherwise have done. We are called upon by this resolution merely to establish the position that a national system is necessary. With reference to the petitions which have been presented to this House against what are called the sectarian grants, I do not conceive for a moment that these petitions negative the position which we take in the House to-night. We are not asking for sectarian grants. (Cries of “Hear, hear.”) I am not in favor of sectarian grants, and, more than that, I have had great pleasure in presenting petitions myself

against these grants. Neither should I have any hesitation about signing these petitions. What do we find in those petitions? We find them speaking of the broad principles on which Toronto University is founded. Now, what are the principles on which Toronto University is founded? Are they not the principles of affiliation? Are they not the principles that are embodied in the Act of 1853? But it is well known that the Act of 1853 has been inoperative. It is well known that its practical effect has not given satisfaction to the country. It is well known, that, when a commission was appointed—I think, in 1862—to enquire into it, having, in the course of a searching examination, addressed a series of leading questions to the Senate of the Toronto University, that Senate declared that the Act had not been complied with, and that affiliation could not take place under it, and recommending, at the same time, a scheme very similar to that which we now advocate. And there is a published letter of the very distinguished head of University College, endorsing the action and the sentiments of the Senate on that question. And will my honorable friends on the Treasury benches, and will other honorable gentlemen in this House say that, when authorities so high as these declare that this Act of 1853 (the University Act) has not met the wants of the country, and that no affiliation could take place under it, although such affiliation was intended to take place—will they say, in the face of facts like these, that they are not prepared to amend an Act, which, it must be apparent to every one, needs to be amended? That is the position of the question, as I understand it. (Hear, hear.) We simply ask the House, by this resolution, to adopt this national system. It does not commit the House to the details of any particular plan; and it is desirable that honorable gentlemen should, in this debate, freely express their opinions on the question, that we may arrive at a correct conclusion in regard to it. We do not ask that honorable gentlemen should commit themselves to all the details of such a system, for details are not embodied in the resolution. It only commits us to the principle, and I am satisfied, whether the House now accepts the principle or not, that, finally, this House, or some other House, will accept it. The country is prepared for a really national system of education, from the Common School up to the University. (Hear, hear.) We have many Institutions in this country with University powers. These powers have been conferred upon them, and we cannot take them away. It is our duty, as far as possible, to endeavor to give increased value to Canadian Degrees. If we cripple the Institutions which already exist having the power to confer such Degrees—if we ignore them altogether—if, in establishing a national system, we say we are not prepared to receive them into it, although they may be willing to become part of a system that would be acceptable to the country—if we say, that simply because these Institutions have, or have had some connection with some denomination or other, we will not receive

them, then I say that is not acting up to the spirit or the intentions of the Act of 1853. (Hear, hear.) I say that, if we are to have a national system, we must have other institutions besides University College in connection with it. I claim that one College is not sufficient to meet the wants of the people of this country. I claim that a country of such extent as this; a country with such vast resources; a country now rapidly rising to wealth and importance, will not be satisfied with one College to educate all its young men. It would be a great injustice to say that all the young men of this country, desiring a University education, should be obliged to come up to the city of Toronto, or to any one given central point, for that education. It would be unfair to expect that they should do so. By insisting on this, we would very greatly lessen the number of those who would attain to University degrees. But it may be that some will say—So much the better for the country. It may be that some will be prepared to say—All we need to do is to give our youth a common school education, and let those who desire a higher education, take care of themselves. But that does not show the real state of the case. Let us confine higher education to one city, as is proposed, by the withdrawal of assistance from other Collegiate Institutions, or by not permitting other Institutions to become affiliated with the Central University, and what, then, will be the effect? The citizens of Toronto would then have an advantage over the rest of the country. They would have at their doors an Institution established by the State, and enriched by a splendid endowment, not only attracting young men from a distance, but giving them superior advantages at home, and they certainly, in that respect, would have the advantage over other portions of the country. But, if we support Collegiate Institutions in different sections of the country, there will be, in each case, a circle of warm friends to rally round such Institutions, and a larger number of young men would be educated in the higher branches than if we centralize the higher education in any one place, or have only one Collegiate Institution. I am satisfied this House is not prepared to say that it is sufficient for us to give encouragement only to Common School education. I am satisfied the intelligence of this country is not prepared to adopt such a position. We have handsomely aided the Common Schools of the country, and we have reason to be proud of our Common School system. The Canadian can point, with a great deal of satisfaction and pride, to the fact that we have in Canada one of the best—if not the very best—Common School system in the world. But, while we are proud of this, let us not stop there. While we are prepared to extend to all, through the whole length and breadth of the land, the advantages of a Common School education, let us, also, extend to the young men of our country who are aspiring to rise to the higher attainments in literature, science and art, the necessary facilities for that purpose, without obliging them to come to a large city, where the expense of living is greater, and against which there may be

prejudices existing—I do not say whether well or ill-founded—among those who live in the country. Let us not compel those who desire to receive a Collegiate training to come to Toronto for that purpose if they do not choose to do so. I do not say how many of these Colleges ought to be sustained ; let that be decided by the circumstances of the country. The principle of the resolution is, that more Institutions than one are needed. It will soon be determined how many the country require. The fact that these Institutions will have to be partially endowed by their friends, and partially self-supporting, will operate as a check on their improper multiplication. It will be an easy matter to limit or extend the number. We are not committed to a certain sum of money for the sustenance of these Colleges. But I think there cannot be a doubt that it is manifestly unfair that the whole higher education should be monopolized by one Institution. (Hear, hear.) The question, then, that arises is this : what system would be the best to meet the want that exists for a sufficient number of well equipped Collegiate Institutions ? Shall we take the Institutions that now exist, or shall we create others ? It is true, there is a difference of opinion about this. Some will say, take the Institutions which now exist. Others will say, establish new ones, and have nothing to do with those which have existed for years, and which have done a valuable work in the country ; commence anew ; erect magnificent buildings, endow professorships handsomely, and establish other Institutions on an expensive scale, similar to that established in the City of Toronto. Now, in the first place, on the ground of justice to the Institutions which now exist, I claim that it would not be right to ignore them, unless they refused to become part of the national system, to surrender their right to confer Degrees in Arts, to adopt the common curriculum, and to submit their students to the examinations of the National University. If they are prepared to submit to all this, I see no reason why they should not be received as part of the national system ; I see no good reason why we should ignore Institutions which have stood the heat and burden of the day—Institutions which, endowed by private liberality, gave our youth the benefits of a Collegiate education, when there were no others that could meet the wants of the country—Institutions which have gone on doing this, and have held their ground for more than a quarter of a century ; I say, I see no reason why, to gratify a mere prejudice, these Institutions should be allowed to die—at least, so far as Government aid is concerned—and other new ones built up on an expensive scale, similar to that in the City of Toronto. It may, perhaps, throw some light on the subject if I read a statement of the endowment of the University of Toronto. It was, in the first instance, endowed with 226,000 acres of valuable land. In 1861, according to a return made in that year, this had produced \$1,398,903, and it was estimated that there remained unsold property of the value of \$167,049—making a total endowment of a little more than a million and a

half of dollars. Now, it becomes this House to consider—whether they consider it under this resolution or not—what value we have got for this million and a half of endowment. And it becomes us to consider, also, whether, in establishing other Institutions on the same basis, at least as far as expenditure is concerned, we would be acting wisely—or whether we would not serve better the interests of the country, by bringing those Institutions that are already established into the national system, and utilizing them in that way, we could not, on a cheaper scale, give the country all the advantages which might, perhaps, be received from a more expensive system. From the returns brought down last year to this House, with reference to the University endowment, we learn that the expenditure has exceeded the income, so as to leave the Fund in debt to the amount of \$70,000. But, suppose we only allow the amount limited by the statute, \$45,000 per annum, and if we suppose this House is prepared to establish other institutions through the country on the same expensive system, I would ask, where will this end? I would rather ask, will there be a beginning at all? Can we expect that this Government, or any other Government, would be prepared to bring down a scheme so expensive as this would be? But something they must do. They cannot expect that the country will be content that no scheme at all shall be brought down; that the position should remain as it is, as has been hinted in certain quarters, that one institution alone should have the monopoly of higher education in this country. I do not refer to these figures with any idea of hostility to the University of Toronto. I do not desire to see it weakened. I would desire to see it strengthened and remodeled, and I believe that the effect of the affiliation of other institutions would be to strengthen rather than to weaken. If other institutions were brought into affiliation with the National University, would not the effect be to stimulate the activity of University College? Would not a wholesome rivalry be produced, which would have the effect of elevating the standard of scholarship? Would not the students of the various colleges, coming to submit to the same examinations, engage in a generous competition, in order that their respective colleges might rival each other, and stand high on the examination list? The effect undoubtedly would be, instead of lowering, to raise the standard of education. The effect would be to give a stimulus to the young men of our country, and to urge them to the attainment of a higher standard, in relation to those studies in which they are engaged. These institutions, sometimes called “the outlying colleges,” as I before intimated, have already University powers. We cannot deprive them of those powers—at least not very easily, and not very justly. They now confer degrees and will continue to confer degrees. We lessen the value of these degrees, if we weaken those institutions—although, I believe as regards some of them, they cannot be permanently weakened by the action of this House—I believe some of them may

be able, by their friends rallying around them, not only to live, but to live efficiently. But that is not the question. If we can make them national, and thereby add increased value to our Canadian University degrees, are we doing a patriotic work, and promoting the interests of our whole country? We know that those who receive those degrees become the leading men of our country—many of them at least. They enter into all the professions; for degrees are not only given in arts, but in law and medicine, and when those who receive them go forth to practice, both the lives and property of the community are, to a certain extent placed in their hands. And I say it becomes the duty of this House to consider well the great importance of the trust which is placed in the hands of these Universities; and, if it is possible for us to give greater efficiency to those colleges, and to bring their course of study, as also that of the National College, up to a higher standard, I claim that we would be doing a public benefit. (Hear, hear.) It is said that some of these institutions are sectarian, and that because they are such, they cannot be received into the national system. I fail, however, to see, that because they have been endowed and fostered by one religious denomination or another, that is any reason why the State may not take them up and make them part of a system which shall be purely and properly national. The fact has been referred to in this debate that King's College was a sectarian institution, and that the Legislature, by an Act of Parliament, made it secular. And although many of the colleges to which I have referred are not sectarian; yet, even if they were so, I see no reason why, if a comprehensive Act were passed under which these college may come, if they choose to waive certain portions of their rights, to adopt a common curriculum, and to submit to a common examination, I see, I say, no reason if this were done, why they should not thus be nationalized. I see no reason why the subject of study, which would be prescribed by the central University, should be taught by a member of one church rather than another; or why this should make any difference with regard to those subjects being properly taught. With reference to our Common and Grammar Schools, we observe that they are presided over, some by members of one church, and some by members of another; but we do not suppose that, because a school is for the time being under the control of a member of a particular church, it is therefore sectarian. The subjects of study taught in those schools are not sectarian; the system to which they belong is not sectarian. And I see no reason why these collegiate institutions, although they may have had connection with, and been built up and sustained by religious denominations, if they are willing to come under the national system, should be excluded. If they are not prepared to come under such a system, then we are not prepared to say that they should receive national aid. For my own part, I have not approved of the system of College Grants in the manner in which they have been given. It is true they met a necessity at the time. It is true they were given, because no

better system was proposed. But some of the institutions, if not all of them, which claimed those grants, repeatedly set forth in their memorials to the Government, that they were prepared for affiliation, that they desired affiliation. As regards the giving of grants merely as such, without reference to any national system, I do not say I am prepared to favor it. I do not say I am prepared to revive the system, as it existed before. But if the colleges, as they now exist, are prepared to come into a general system, on the broad national basis which is aimed at by this resolution, I see no reason why it should be a barrier to their being received, that they have been built up and fostered by the members of a particular denomination. (Hear, hear.) If we examine the systems which prevail in other countries we will not find that this strong prejudice exists against institutions which are called denominational, but which are doing in this respect a secular work, that is, giving a secular education. What do we find, if we examine the system which prevails in the United States—the country, of all countries, where Church and State lines are most clearly drawn ; where the semblance of connection between Church and State never existed from first to last ; from the ascendancy which the spirit of the old Puritan fathers has maintained over that country ? We find that even there, denominational institutions, so far as they gave secular learning, have been supported and fostered by the State, and received State aid, from time to time, as they required it. If we examine the system in the State of New York, we will find that there is a regular system under which assistance is distributed to these institutions, without reference to the fact whether they are denominational or not. We find there a fund set apart amounting to \$40,000 a year, and that this fund is distributed to the various institutions of higher education in the State, in proportion to the work done, and this is given irrespective of the denomination with which the College is connected. By a reference to the statutes of the State of New York, we find it is provided—“There shall be paid annually, by the treasurer, on the warrant of “the Comptroller, out of the revenues derived from the literature fund, to “the several academies under the supervision of the regents of the University, the sum of \$12,000, and the further sum of \$28,000 from the income “of the United States deposit fund, being in all \$40,000, according to an “appointment to be made by the regents among the said academies, in proportion to the number of pupils in each who shall have pursued the requisite studies to enable them to share in said distribution.”

It will be observed that denominational colleges are not excluded by this Act, so that aid is thus given to such institutions. And in addition to this, I have before me a list of special educational grants given to institutions of this character, and on what principle ? Not because the institutions were denominational or non-denominational ; but because they were educational. It was not a question of their connection with one particular sect or another.

The question simply was asked, Are they doing a valuable work for the country? Are they educating the youth of the land? The principle being laid down that the State ought to assist, in the education of its youth; if an educational institution comes up to the proper standard, it ought to receive a certain portion of aid. That is the principle on which the State of New York has acted, and on which many other States have acted; and that in a country in which Church and State lines have always been most clearly drawn. And are we in this country, simply to ask to what particular sect this or that institution belongs? The question I believe, which ought to be asked is—What work are they doing? You do not say that in any respect State assistance, either directly or indirectly, should be given to teach the peculiar tenets of any sect. We believe these ought to be supported, solely by the denominations themselves. But that is a different question from whether the State ought to support, under proper restrictions, secular education, even though that secular education might be to some extent under denominational control. We believe there can be no good ground of objection to this. Again, if we look at the collegiate institutions of the old world, we will find that this prejudice does not exist with respect to them—that not only do numerous institutions exist; that not only is there no attempt to centralize in one place all the learning of any one of the countries, but that there is a distributive system. We see London University, with its 50, or thereabouts, of affiliated institutions in different parts of the country—Oxford with 21 Colleges; and Cambridge with 17; the University of France, with numerous Colleges scattered all over the country; and in Switzerland, a College in every canton. In none of those countries is the idea entertained of centralizing in one place all the higher education of the land. And many of these institutions are either partially or entirely under denominational control. They are aided as secular institutions doing a secular work, affording a secular education—it being held that, as such, they are entitled to receive from the State a certain portion of State assistance. In this country I do not say that it is necessary for us to go even that far. We need not lay down a principle so unrestricted as that. We may say that we will not give State aid to institutions that will not be under State control. But even then I see no reason why we should ignore the colleges already existing in the country. I am not authorized to speak for them, but I do not know but some scheme might be devised which might be acceptable to those institutions, and which at the same time might meet the necessities of the country. I think it is possible that some scheme might be devised by a remodelling of the constitutions of the Boards of these Colleges, which would remove any objection that may now exist, and which would give us the benefit of the standing already attained by these institutions, and at the same time give us the benefit of having them in different parts of the country. The value of the work that has been done by these colleges is now admitted. It has

been referred to already very ably in this debate ; the public press has not failed to recognize it, and the country has not failed to recognize it. All over the land there are now those in the different professions, and in the various walks of commerce and industry, who have been sent out by them, and who, by the verdict of the country, are valuable members of Society, and who would not have been in a position to take the place they do but for these institutions. I believe then the country is prepared to accept the statement that these colleges have yielded results of the highest value, and with but little cost to the State. There is scarcely an hon. gentleman here who would for a moment detract from them, or be unwilling to admit that they have rendered good service to the cause of education. (Hear, hear.) And if this be the case, I see no reason why we should place them in a position which might in any respect weaken their efficiency, or render them less able to afford a thorough course of training to the young men placed under their care. We need not do it, even for the sake of making a show of consistency with respect to old principles. I say there is no old principle involved in it. It may be said that it is part of the Reform platform to do away with denominational grants. But we find that for many years these institutions have been supported by men of all political creeds, and we do not find that there has been any serious movement to oppose their getting the assistance they have received—not, perhaps, because it was the best way to give it, but because they were doing a public good. They were educating the young men of the country, and as such the Legislature considered they were entitled to have that support. It may be, that it might have been given better in another way. Some of these institutions themselves asked affiliation on proper terms. They were not satisfied with the system of grants. They felt it was humiliating for them to have to come session after session and ask, as a boon, what they should have been considered entitled to, as giving full value for it. I know, however, that there are some who look at this question from a different point of view. No matter how much you may nationalize these colleges ; no matter how much you may strip them of their supposed or real sectarianism, you cannot in the eyes of some, wash them from the supposed contamination in which their connection with denominations is supposed to have involved them. I do not conceive such a position is reasonable or statesmanlike. If we need institutions of higher learning ; if we desire to tread in the footsteps of older and more illustrious countries ; if we desire to extend the advantages of higher education, let us endeavour to lay aside what may be our prejudices. Let us be patriotic if we can, and let us endeavour to establish a system, which, though we may not be able to perfect now, will yet be the foundation of a system that will grow with our growth, and strengthen with our strength. (Hear, hear.) If we exclude these colleges from our national system of higher education, I do not say they will all die. I believe some of them will live, and very efficiently too ; but they will not

live as part of the national system ; they will become more intensely sectarian, by being obliged to apply more peculiarly to those who belong to their own particular church for support. If they are obliged to resort to that, by being driven away from the national system, the effect will be to make them more sectarian, instead of less. But if they are willing to be received as part of the national system ; if the constitution of their Boards be re-organized ; if they are striped altogether of what may be called sectarianism, I do not see why in that case we should not receive them, instead of having scattered over the country a number of sectarian colleges, as they must be in fact as well as in name. I do not see why now, as we are about remodelling our educational system—as we are now about, as I understand, to have a responsible Minister of Education—and as we find Bills introduced for a change in the law with regard to medicine and surgery—I do not see why we may not commence here ; why we may not commence with the Arts Department, and let the same principle be applied through all the departments of higher education. I should like to see a complete system, which should embrace the whole circle of arts, law, and medicine—a system comprehensive in its character, which, commencing with the Common and Grammar Schools, and proceeding up to the University, would include all the institutions, which prepared our young men for the various professions and positions in life. I should like to see such a system, under a management responsible to this House and to the country. Were this realized—and if these institutions were placed under such a system, it must be very clear that every disadvantage—at least so far as any practical result is concerned—of what may appear so very obnoxious to some, namely, the denominationalism of these colleges, would certainly be removed. I believe the country is prepared for the adoption of this national system. I believe the country will demand something of this kind, and that it will yet be granted, whatever may be the present decision of the House. I do not assert that the country is now in favor of the grants as they were formerly given. I am not myself in favor of them, because I believe a better system can be devised. It is the duty of the Administration to take this question up, and deal with it as its importance demands. I believe the country will require this at their hands, for I have not the least doubt but that when this question is fully understood by the people, free from those prejudices which now to some extent surround it, there will be a general demand for equal justice to all our educational institutions, and an unmistakable opposition to monopoly. Let not narrow prejudices stand in the way of national education, but now as we have already laid the foundation of an excellent system of Common School education, let us also lay the foundation of a system of University education, which shall be general, permanent, and truly national in its character.

MR. RYKERT'S SPEECH.

Mr. RYKERT said—In entering upon the discussion of this question, I start from the principle that, no matter what position a man occupies in life, he is entitled to education. I hold it to be the first duty of the representatives of the people, to see that the intellectual resources of the country are fully developed. The Legislature, in undertaking this duty, has taken a step in the right direction. It has already shewn its determination, that the education of the people shall be advanced to the utmost possible extent. At the present time, we have a Common School system, the like of which is not to be found in any other country ; and we have already experienced the benefits which that system has conferred on the people of this country. It has given educational advantages to the remotest corners of our land, the fruits of which are daily to be seen. Then we have a Grammar School system, which, if not so flourishing as it might be ; yet, if properly carried out, must help the education of the country to a great extent. We have, too, Upper Canada College, against which a violent crusade has been directed this session, which has yielded incalculable benefits, having sent out into the world many men who are the brightest ornaments in the country. Then we have our King's College, now University College, and the University ; and I am sure no one will deny that these institutions have brilliant representatives all through the world, holding a high rank in arts, literature, medicine, and jurisprudence—men whose position is a testimony to native genius, and who have done credit to the halls in which they were educated. In science, too, and in arms, we have representatives who do credit to this country, and who are a living example of the good the institutions are doing for the country. And I say it is unfair for the hon. gentlemen to cry out against University College or Upper Canada College, when they see what work these institutions have done. I hope this cry against Toronto centralizing everything will receive no favor at the hands of this House. I myself, educated in Toronto, though not a native of the place, can bear my humble testimony to the benefits those institutions have conferred on the people of this country ; and I am willing to leave it to the people to say whether those in Toronto have not conferred a Provincial education on our youth. Take Upper Canada College

for example. In years gone by, what proportion of its students were from Toronto? In my own day, out of 200 pupils, not more than 25 or 30 were from Toronto. It was not an institution giving merely a local advantage, but was attended by youth from one end of the country to the other; nay, from one end of the world to the other. And can you call that a local institution, whose advantages are so wide-spread, and which has sent forth men who are an ornament to the whole country? It matters not from what town, or from what particular locality they came, in consequence of the education they have received here, they have done credit to themselves and to the country. Hon. gentlemen say that the press of Toronto is united in support of these colleges in Toronto, and against the denominational colleges. If this be so, they have the sentiments expressed by them echoed from one end of the country to the other. (Hear, hear.) Wherever you go, even into the remotest corners of the land, you find the people, as a unit, opposed to sectarian institutions and denominational colleges. (Cheers.) I can myself with some degree of grace, enforce this view on the House. In 1860, this was the test question at the election in the County of Lincoln. One branch of the Methodists at that time were rampant to pull down University College, and to have the surplus funds divided among all denominations. The ground I took at that election, was that we were not prepared to divide our University fund among all religious denominations, according to numbers, and the view I took was upheld by my constituents. I can, therefore, with some consistency uphold to-night the ground I then assumed, and which helped to place me in the old Legislature of Canada. As regards the press of this country denouncing the denominational colleges, I feel fully satisfied with the result of their work. What do we see here to night? Instead of hon. gentlemen coming here to ask for sectarian grants, we find them asking the House to do what? To entertain a proposition for the affiliation of these colleges with Toronto University! I would put more faith in their making such a proposition, and would give more attention to the position they assume to-night, were I not aware that the country had been flooded from one end to the other with petitions; not asking for an affiliation of these colleges with Toronto University; not asking this House to withhold grants from denominational colleges; but asking that these grants should be renewed. And I beg to say that I hold the Government as somewhat responsible for those petitions. In their over-delicacy last session—and I distinctly charged it upon them—instead of coming out and saying that they would not give money for denominational colleges, they said they were not in favor of granting aid to superior education. And we see what use has been made of this.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—When did the Government say that?

Mr. RYKERT—At page 31 of the Public Accounts, for which the Treasurer is especially responsible, I find the words—"Aid to superior educa-

tion," with reference to these denominational grants. (Hear, hear and laughter.) I would rather that the Government had distinctly said—"We are giving aid to these denominational colleges for the last time."

Hon. Mr. WOOD—So we did say in the statute-book.

Mr. RYKERT—What I say is, that the gentlemen who have got up these petitions, finding the expression, "aid to superior education" in the estimates, have taken it and placed it in their petitions. Now let us see what they ask for. They represent—

"That for many years it has been part of the policy of the Government of this country to foster, by pecuniary assistance, the important cause of superior education."

And what do they mean by that? They mean sectarian colleges, denominational colleges. They go on to say—

"Wherefore your petitioners earnestly pray that during the present session, steps may be taken by your honourable House towards making a liberal and permanent provision in the aid of the distributive system of superior education."

That is by granting aid to collegiate institutions. They went about the work in a very specious way. They asked people to sign a petition in favor of superior education, and of course scarcely any one could refuse to sign such a petition. But under the cloak of praying for aid to superior education, they ask for a continuance of these grants. I say they ought to have come before this House, and said distinctly at once—"We ask for those grants." It is not fair to put a resolution before the House, the real object of which, under the pretence of affiliating these colleges with Toronto University, is to stab Toronto University, and to get from the Government what share they could of its endowment. The hon. gentleman who introduced this resolution, I admit, has introduced it in his usual temperate and moderate manner. But the resolution previously introduced by the hon. gentleman, throws as much light on the matter as the hon. gentleman's speech. A short time ago, the hon. member for Grenville placed this Resolution before the House.

"That in the opinion of this House, it is expedient and necessary for the promotion of science, literature and art, that the collegiate institutions of Ontario should continue to receive substantial aid and support from the Treasury of the Province."

And he accompanied this with Resolution No. 2 :—

"That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, praying that he be graciously pleased to give effect to the foregoing Resolution."

Notice was given of these Resolutions by the hon. member for South Grenville, whether directly in the interest of those who favor sectarian grants, I am not prepared to say. But, after ascertaining what was the tone of the House, he comes down with another Resolution—that which is now before us for debate—

“That in the opinion of this House it is necessary and expedient, in the interest of collegiate education, that some comprehensive scheme be devised and adopted for giving effect to the objects, and for extending the operation of the Act 16 Vic., chap. 89, in the establishment of a Provincial University, and the affiliation of colleges to be supported in connection therewith.”

Now what prompted that Resolution? Was it simply a desire on the part of the hon. gentleman, to benefit our educational institutions? Was it simply a desire on his part to further and advance the interests of those institutions, which heretofore had been of a sectarian character, and which we hear to-night from the mouths of hon. gentlemen who have spoken in this debate, are now prepared to forego all the privileges they now enjoy as sectarian institutions? But, if these Colleges are prepared to affiliate with Toronto University, why have they not come here with a petition, saying—“We are prepared to forego our powers of conferring degrees, to accept affiliation with Toronto University, and to put ourselves at the mercy of the House?” If they had taken this course; if, instead of having our lobbies overflowed with clerical gentlemen asking aid for these colleges; if, instead of having the country flooded with petitions asking aid for these colleges, the movement being instigated by one denomination alone; if, instead of this, they had come and said—“We are prepared to give up the power of conferring degrees, and to affiliate with Toronto University,” they would have been in a better position. And what did they now ask the House to do? To devise some scheme by which other colleges may affiliate with Toronto University? Have you heard an hon. gentleman to-night advance a word in favor of affiliating other colleges? Have you heard one of them say—“Let us affiliate the Albert University of Belleville, the Hellmuth College of London, or the Baptist College of Woodstock?” No, not a voice was raised in that direction. Their position was this—“We take care of ourselves, and do not care what becomes of the rest of you.” The hon. member for Welland says he is opposed to sectarian grants. When did he change his views? Let me read a passage from the speech the hon. gentleman addressed to the House on this question, in February last. The hon. gentleman then said :—

“The fact was that even on the question of economy, the system pursued in Canada in the past, has been the right one.”

That is, the system pursued of making grants in favor of all sectarian denominations, for the members of the old Parliament of Canada ran riot in

their efforts to pander to the feelings of different denominations. The hon. gentleman went on to say—

“What remarks he might make were not, he would explain, made in a spirit of hostility to the University in Toronto ; but he was compelled to say, even as regarded economy, the old system of Provincial aid to other institutions was the best.

Mr. BEATTY—I beg leave to correct the hon. gentleman. I deny that he has been able to make out in any way that I have changed my views with regard to denominational grants. I did not state last session that I was favorable to denominational grants as such ; although I may have stated that, in point of economy, as I did to-night, that way of sustaining these institutions was the best. What I stated was, that they were more cheaply sustained, because the Government aid merely supplemented private liberality, and the advantages of higher education were thus secured at comparatively little cost to the country. I will read from the report in the *Globe* the remarks I made on that point :

“If the present grants were to be discontinued, let another system be inaugurated to meet the wants of the country in another way. Let us have a central University—(hear, hear)—and affiliated with it all colleges that would conform to a common curriculum, and come under a common system. Let those institutions alike receive Provincial support, so that they might not have to come here every year begging for what they had a right to receive. As regarded institutions which would not come into that common system, he would not ask support for them.”

I claim that there was nothing in my remarks to-night, which was at all inconsistent with what I stated on that occasion. I laid down to-night, in substance, exactly the same policy as I did on that occasion.

Mr. RYKERT—I am not at all answerable for the hon. gentleman's vagaries. He has only succeeded in showing that he can set up an argument in the first part of his speech, and knock it down in the latter part of the same speech. I have quoted his exact language ; I have no doubt it was correctly reported, for I remember the same report was scattered broadcast all over the hon. gentleman's own county. And what further did the hon. gentleman say ?

“He had been elected as a Reformer, and standing there that day as a Reformer, he repudiated any such doctrine, and was prepared to say that these grants in the past had been right and in accordance with good government.”

I do not say whether the hon. gentleman was right or wrong, but simply quote his language ; and I say his remarks then were quite inconsistent with the language he held to-night.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—Won't you allow a man to change his views ?

Mr. RYKERT—I have no objection to a man's changing his views, even should he have paid \$500 for the privilege of moving a resolution at a meeting called by those in the interest of one College, in favor of granting aid to denominational Colleges. The hon. gentleman has been pleased to say that the Collegiate Institutions of the neighbouring State partook of a denominational character. But he is not aware, perhaps, of the fact, that, under the new Constitution, submitted to the people a short time ago, and which will become law, I believe, in a few days, these denominational Colleges are to be thrown overboard. The State of New York has often been held up for the admiration of us Provincials. But there the entire system of State grants in aid of denominational Colleges is about to be done away with—and why ? For the same reason as here—because the lobbies at Albany, as the report of the Committee alleges, have been crammed with these white-chokered gentlemen. Hon. gentlemen say, we should follow the example of England. I admit that the Institutions of England are such as we should copy. They are Institutions which have, and rightly have, a firm and lasting hold on every true Anglo-Saxon. But, let us see what has been done there. There was a Commission appointed by the highest authority in the land, on the subject of University education, composed of Lord Stanley and other eminent gentlemen of all political creeds. And what do these Commissioners say ? I take it for granted that a recommendation coming from such high authority will have equal weight with the hon. gentleman's advocacy of sectarian grants—and, I hope, greater weight, in this House. At page 40 of their report, they say :—

“Denominational Schools have, in some respects, a high value—and, in particular, they can often secure zealous and able service at a cheaper rate than other Schools, and can then bring a high kind of education within reach of those who could not otherwise afford it ; but it would be thought unjust that Institutions claiming to be national should be administered in the interest of a single section of the nation.”

We thus see that these gentlemen, men of the highest education in England, representing the best Institutions in the world, say, in their recommendations to the House of Commons, that all these denominational Colleges should be done away with ; and we are, happily, in advance of them, for we have already decided that we shall have no denominational Colleges, supported by the State, or recognized by the State, and that we shall make no sectarian grants for higher education. The people of England, in this respect, are fast following in our wake—and I think no man who has profitted by the lessons of history will endeavor to revive those issues of the past. Hon. gentlemen, who are supporting this resolution, base the whole of their argument on the ground, that, in past years, Toronto University has wasted the University Fund. I am not here to speak in defence of any

reckless extravagance on the part of that Institution. I am not here to say it is justified in the course it has taken in the past in that respect. But, I say, that Institution has done great service to the country. I say, no man can deny that it has been of great benefit to the country; and, even if money has been uselessly expended, evidence has been given that the Institution is now on a right and secure basis. But these gentlemen are now raising the hue and cry—"Why not give us the surplus fund?" The same cry they made years ago. But, we cannot forget, that, when the secularization of the Clergy Reserves was the chief topic of conversation through the country, and the principal theme of discussion at the polls, these same gentlemen, who now cry out for sectarian grants, were the loudest then in crying out for an entire separation of Church and State; and, yet, so soon as a little bone was thrown to themselves, they grasped at it. Let us see what is the language of the 54th clause of the University Act? It says:—

"Any surplus of the said University Income Fund remaining at the end of any year, after defraying the expenses payable out of the same, shall constitute a fund to be, from time to time, appropriated by Parliament for academical education in Upper Canada."

Is there anything said there about these denominational colleges? Have not the Baptists the same right, under that clause, to claim support for their Institute, from this surplus fund? Have not the German Mennonist—an important class in my county and in other counties—an equal right to share in the benefits of that fund? That money was not set aside, or a permanent fund constituted for denominational colleges. It was a fund placed in the hands of the Government for the advancement of higher education, and the Government are responsible for its proper distribution. I am opposed to giving public money to these sectarian institutions. I am opposed to giving money to these denominational colleges. I am opposed to granting aid to any institution whose management is under the control of any particular denomination. It may be true that they do a large amount of secular work, but the fact stares us in the face that their administration is in the hands of a sect—that their executive department is presided over by men belonging to a particular denomination. They do not come here to tell us that they are prepared to give the Government power and control over their University. If they came to us with this proposition—"We will give the Government a controlling authority, the power to come into the institution and say what work shall be done in it, the power to see that its curriculum is a proper one;" if they did this, they would have a better standing in the House. But they do nothing of the sort. I come now to the arguments advanced by the honorable member for Algoma, (Mr. Cumberland). I listened, as I usually do, with a great deal of pleasure to the remarks which fell from that honorable gentleman. His remarks on any subject that comes before the

House, are always instructive, and oftener amusing. But when the honorable gentleman sat down, I was at a loss to know on which side he had been speaking—whether he was in favor of or opposed to the spoliation of Toronto University—whether he was in favor of, or opposed to sectarian grants. (Laughter.) We heard him warmly upbraiding the Government for the course they took last session. We heard him complain that the Premier, by a stroke of his pen, had dared, in the most flippant manner, to wipe away all denominational grants. Now what did the honorable gentleman say on the occasion when the Government announced that policy. He said—"I heartily concur in the policy of the Government." (Laughter and cheers.) And now he comes down to this House, and gives the country to understand that he was opposed to that course.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—I understood him, in the latter part of his speech this afternoon, to say that he fully endorsed the action taken last session.

Mr. RYKERT—I will read what the honorable gentleman said last session. He will not dispute the accuracy of the report, for it is that of his own organ, the *Leader* :—

"He rejoiced that the Government had taken the stand it had with regard to the grants for superior education ; and he trusted that in future all grants to sectarian colleges would be stopped, and he avowed that the churches ought to be self sustaining and independent. He was prepared to stand by the Ministry." (Laughter.)

But in the same breath he asked the House to continue the grant to Trinity College, and sanctioned the proposition now made by the honorable member for Grenville.

Mr. CUMBERLAND—I rise to offer a word of explanation, and perhaps some further amusement to my honorable friend, who is so easily amused by my remarks. My honorable friend seems to have got into the fashion of picking out short paragraphs from speeches, without giving honorable members the advantage, whatever it may be, of a full exposition of their views. It is perfectly true that I did say last year that the stoppage of these grants was proper and wise. I said so to-night. But my remarks had reference to the term of a year, during which those grants were to be continued. What I said last year was, that I gave credit to the Government for something like a statesmanlike dealing with the question, and that I expected before that year expired we would have, what my honorable friend from Welland has spoken of to-night—something like a national system, which would give us all the benefits to be derived from the affiliated colleges, apart altogether from the question of sectarianism. (Cheers.)

Mr. RYKERT—I am sure the honorable gentleman's explanations are best answered by the quotation of his own language. The honorable gentleman reminds me very much of a person cast away at sea, without a compass, a helm, or a pilot ; and I am sure that, in that position, he has a strong claim on the sympathy of the House. (Laughter.) He calls to my mind the story I have heard of a Presbyterian clergyman, who went to stay over night at a friend's house, and at family worship said—"Let us invoke a prayer for the man at sea." It seems to me that the more efforts my honorable friend vainly makes to get to shore, the deeper he succeeds in getting into a dense fog ; but I trust that when he has fully weighed the matter, he will come to the conclusion that hitherto he has been all wrong, and that he will tack about, and discover the propriety of joining in the popular cry—the cry of the people of this country against these sectarian grants. I am bold to make the assertion that the great mass of the electoral body of this country are opposed to the continuance of these grants. The policy of the Government announced last session, has been favorably responded to from one end of the country to the other. Though honorable gentlemen may say we are not representing the views of our constituents, they will find that the more they stir the question the more they will arouse the feelings of the people of this country as to these denominational institutions ; the more they will find that the people are determined to oppose, and to keep out of the Legislature men who express such opinions as these honorable gentlemen have expressed in this debate. I am in favor, however, of the proposition announced by the honorable member for Welland—the proposition of having one national University. I am in favor of having one University in this country for conferring degrees. And, if honorable gentlemen are so much afraid of the name of Toronto University, I do not object to its being called the University of Ontario. So far as the prosperity and welfare of this country are concerned, and so far as the interests of the education of its youth are concerned, it matters not that the name of Toronto University be retained, though, from old associations, I might myself prefer the name of Toronto University to that of the University of Ontario. But, let us have one great central Institution for conferring degrees. Let us not have these Institutions, with the power of conferring degrees, all over the country—Institutions whose standard of education has been pronounced to be low. Let our young men be in a position to get a degree which will be a passport to carry them through the world. Let the people of this country, and people abroad, know that we have a University on such a basis, that its degrees will be a guarantee to the world that the man who receives it is well educated. We have already, in different parts of England, men who have gone from Toronto University, and who, in England, have taken the highest scholastic honors. A short time ago, a poor boy from the County of Monck, who had spent just one year at Toronto University, carried off from the London University the

highest scholarship awarded to students from the Colonies. And when we find persons like that coming from the rural districts to Toronto University—for it is to his training at Toronto University that that young man is indebted for the position he now occupies—I say, it is well for us to see that that University is maintained in a position of efficiency, in which it will be the pride, glory and boast of every Canadian. It should be the interest of every true Canadian, no matter what his creed, nationality, or colour, to raise the standard of education. Let us see, then, that our youth, to whatever part of the country they belong, have facilities for education. Let us carry forward our Common School system—let us place our Grammar Schools on a proper basis—and, if it is necessary to have these other Colleges affiliated, let us take from them their denominational character and power of conferring degrees, and then affiliate them. (Hear, hear.) I say that the honorable gentlemen who are supporting this resolution come here on false pretences. (Cries of “No! no!”) They say they come here backed up by petitions signed by 18,000 persons—praying, forsooth, for “aid to superior education.” But what of the petitions on the other side? In my own County, 120 have asked aid for sectarian education, and 560 have petitioned against it—and this out of a population of 37,000. I say the voice of the country is clearly against granting aid to these sectarian Institutions. When the system of Confederation was introduced, we fondly hoped that all these old causes of dispute and strife were at an end—that the old cries, which drove many good men from office, and enabled many bad men to get in, had for ever disappeared. But, I tell these honorable gentlemen, that, if they press their claims for denominational Colleges, the result will be a hue and cry from one end of the country to the other, which will most signally defeat the object they have in view. In order that the House may meet the question fairly and squarely, I now move, in amendment to the resolution:—

“That all the words after ‘That,’ in the original resolution, be struck out, and the following be inserted in lieu thereof: While the House recognizes the importance of educational interests, it is still of the opinion (as expressed by the Act of last session), that no College or Educational Institution under the control of any religious denomination, should receive aid from the Public Treasury.”

Seconded by Mr. SECORD.

Mr. CLARKE—Before that amendment is put, I beg to raise a point of order. I believe it is a rule of this House that the subject-matter of any amendment should bear a distinct relation to the original resolution. In my resolution there is not a solitary word about denominational Colleges; and the honorable gentleman proposes to strike out the whole of my resolution, and to substitute something about denominational Colleges, which is totally foreign to the subject-matter of my resolution. I ask the opinion of the Speaker on the point. The honorable gentleman wishes to raise a false

issue. I distinctly stated, and the seconder of the resolution, and my honorable friends who followed him, also most distinctly stated, that we were not in favor of grants to denominational Colleges. And the honorable gentleman seeks to evade the issue I raised by withdrawing from the consideration of the House my resolution, and substituting one not at all germane to it.

Mr. BLAKE read a passage from May's "Parliamentary Practice," page 181, to show, that, according to the practice of the House of Commons, this amendment to the resolution before the Chair would be considered in order.

Hon. Mr. CAMERON—I think the amendment is relevant to the question brought before the House by the resolution. We know, as a matter of fact, that we have only one national Provincial University, and that the other Institutions are denominational Colleges. The resolution speaks of a Provincial University, "and the affiliation of Colleges to be supported in connection therewith." Now, it is surely germane to that, to say, as the amendment does, that no aid shall be granted to denominational Colleges.

Mr. CLARKE—My answer to that is this. If it is the object of the honorable member for Lincoln to obtain that declaration from the House; he should not move to strike out the entire language of my resolution, but should move something to be appended to my resolution, instead of withdrawing from the consideration of the House the subject I have brought before it. If his amendment were brought up in the form of a distinct resolution, perhaps I myself, and others of my friends, might vote for it—but, when he proposes in his amendment to strike out the whole of my resolution, we cannot vote for it.

Mr. BLAKE—I rise to order. The discussion should be confined to the point of order, without impugning the motives of the honorable member for Lincoln.

Mr. CLARKE repeated that the proper course would be for the honorable gentleman to propose the amendment as words to be added to his (Mr. Clarke's) resolution, and not to strike out the language of that resolution.

Mr. McKELLAR—Will the honorable gentleman be kind enough to give us his authority for that view—we do not find it here (pointing to May.)

Mr. CLARKE—Have you looked for it? (Laughter.)

Mr. McKELLAR—Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER then decided as follows :—The amendment is, I think, in order, and ought to be received.

Mr. SECORD seconded the amendment. He said the people of Canada desired nothing in the shape of Church and State. They were opposed to it. In his constituency they were unanimously against sectarian grants, and, for that reason, he would second the amendment.

MR. COYNE'S SPEECH.

Mr. COYNE said—In rising to address the House on this question, I feel that in one sense I might go a certain distance with both propositions—with the original motion and with the amendment. Allow me to say at the outset that I think the mover of the amendment might very well have spared at any rate the indulging in some remarks of an uncalled-for character—I mean his allusions to certain clerical gentlemen whom he pictured out as being found in the lobbies of this House. Though in heart at sympathy to a great extent with the honorable gentleman, and as regards the question before the House, I regret that he should have made the remarks to which I am now alluding. I regret exceedingly that remarks of that kind should fall from the lips of any honorable member. I have yet to learn that it is not the privilege and the right of every subject of Her Majesty to visit this House at all seasonable times during its discussions and debates. If any weight were to be attached to the honorable gentleman's remarks, I suppose gentlemen would have to be very careful hereafter about visiting the House with white chokers on.

Mr. RYKERT—Hear ! Hear !

Mr. COYNE—The honorable gentleman cries “hear, hear.” I do not know whether his constituents will endorse his course, in speaking in a manner calculated to wound the Christian feelings of the people of this country. I should regret exceedingly that a constituency so important, or that any

constituency in this country should be found endorsing the tone of remarks of a sarcastic nature, and with a tendency to infidelity itself, which had been indulged in, not only by the mover, but by the seconder of the amendment.

Mr. RYKERT—My constituents have elected me twice by acclamation.

Mr. COYNE—And I recollect an occasion on which the honorable gentleman did not return to his seat by acclamation ; and when the honorable gentleman plumes himself on his honors, I feel free to remind him of that occasion—although he may now enjoy a seat in this House, having conveniently changed his opinions since the time when he was succeeded in that constituency by another honorable gentleman. (Hear, hear.) I speak thus warmly with reference to the honorable gentleman's remarks, because I feel warmly with reference to the subject. For I feel that an honorable gentleman should not so far forget what he owes to the House, as to speak in an uncalled for and derogatory manner of the character of any Christian clergymen. (Hear, hear.) But, to come to the question now at issue before this House, I say it is a most important one. It is one, in the discussion of which we should rise above the party feelings of the day, and treat it as men fully alive to its important and momentous bearings. The question is fairly before the House and before the country, and we are bound to deal with it. Now I can safely say, so far as I am concerned personally, not only as regards the present, but in the past, that I have never, by my voice or influence, given any support or countenance to the grants heretofore made to the denominational colleges. I am in a position, therefore, to take my stand firmly on the question, and in dealing with it in its national bearings, and in all its national magnitude, to meet it fairly on its merits. The question is not what were the influences from Lower Canada which we had to contend with in the past, or what the education of the people of this country has been in the past. We are now assembled as a distinct Province, having the control of our own local affairs—and in the name of our common country, I ask honorable gentlemen to show themselves capable of rising to the importance of this great question, that is now placed before them. (Hear, hear.) In proceeding to deal with it, I will at once state my firm conviction that there may be a non-denominational monopoly as much as a denominational monopoly. There is no reason why, if we discontinue the grants on the system on which they have been given in the past, if we have taken a proper stand in doing so—and the Government, I contend, have taken a proper stand, so far as they have gone—there is no reason why they should stop short, and leave the matter in the half-settled state in which they have left it at the present time. I believe the hour is come, and I believe the man equal to the hour is now at the head of affairs in this country, who can settle the question. (Hear, hear.) I say, the country calls upon that honorable gentleman to take hold of the question with a firm

hand, and believes that that question has a claim on the honorable gentleman's countenance and support in this House, from the fact that he has been consistently an advocate of all liberal measures, during his whole public life, for the last twenty-eight years. During that time, the honorable gentleman's voice has never been given against the people of this country on any great question. And I ask him now not to go with a party—not to go with what is pretended to be the popular voice for the time being—not to leave this matter in the unsettled state in which this resolution would leave it—not to forget his duty to the country and the position he now holds, by thus leaving the question unsettled. I believe it is the desire of every honorable member of this House that this question should be settled on a firm and broad national basis, such as will meet the approval and support of all right-thinking men. I think it must be the opinion of all who are desirous of the welfare and prosperity of our common country, that no man could be more fittingly selected, and that no man could be more competent to deal with the question than the honorable gentleman now at the head of the administration of affairs in this Province—and I ask him not lightly to pass by the opportunity of settling it, now presented to him. It may be said—"You have the statute of 1853—accept of its terms; except in connection with that Act, we know nothing about you." Or, on the other hand, it may be said—"You have nothing to do with the endowment of University College; it was a grant given by George the Third, in 1791, and was never taken out of the pockets of the people of this country." Now, as far as I am concerned, I may be young in public life, but I will be long in public life before I assume that the people do not own the endowment of the University—that it does not belong to the people of this country, every tittle of it. I believe that it is a fund which belongs to the people, and that we have a full right to deal with it, and to see that it is fairly distributed, so that all portions of the people of this country may enjoy the benefit of it. I do not believe that it was given for the benefit of one particular party, who, under the name of the few gentlemen designated as the Senate of the University, shall have the entire control and management of it. It was given for the benefit of the whole people of this country, and it becomes the Government of the Province to see that that endowment is administered in accordance with the terms on which it was originally granted. Having said this much, I would just ask honorable gentlemen to reflect for a few moments, as to how this endowment came into the hands of those who now enjoy it, and see whether they can say to us—"You have no right to insist on an inspection into our affairs."

Mr. BLAKE—Hear ! hear !

Mr. COYNE—As far as I am concerned, I have no personal interest or personal desire to serve in this matter. What I do desire, is, to some extent, to serve my country. I do desire to see this much vexed question

removed from the arena of political strife, and a national system of education built up on the good-will and hearts, and free voice and hearty support of the whole people of this country, so far as this is practicable to be done. I will be asked—What are my own views in reference to this question? I shall state the proposition that was made in 1861, as to the terms on which this endowment should be divided among the people. I do not stand here as the spokesman of those denominational gentlemen, and have nothing to do with them whatever. I have no knowledge of them, with reference to their denominational position or sectarian names. I must say, a great deal of blame rests on the men who are knocking at the door of this chamber and asking those grants. They are the men who assisted in wresting from King's College what did not belong to it; and why did they not then take the stand which they take to-day? Why did they not join in establishing a truly national system? If they are now in the position that they have sown the wind and are reaping the whirlwind, the fault rests with themselves. So long as they received those annual grants, they accepted them, and were satisfied with them, and were willing to allow the most wealthy endowments for educational purposes in the world to be swamped. I say, the management of that endowment is no credit to the gentlemen who have had charge of it in times past. But I do hope the time is now come when the whole system of education in this country will be put on a better basis—from the Common Schools, up through the Grammar Schools, the people's Colleges, to the University. Though I stand here as the representative of a Conservative constituency, I say that that last relic of the family compact, Upper Canada College, deserves no consideration at the hands of this House, or at the hands of the people of this country. I say, we should give the people their rights in reference to this matter, and wipe out the very existence of Upper Canada College. But I shall refer again to that branch of the question before I close. Meanwhile, I shall quote a proposition which was made as long ago as 1861, for the settlement of this question. I quote from Dr. Ryerson's pamphlet:—

“1. That there shall be a National University for Upper Canada, as was contemplated by the University Act of 1853.

“2. That the Senate of the University shall be under the control of no one College more than another; shall be independent of all Colleges, and prescribe the standard and course of studies for all Colleges (except in Divinity), and direct the examinations, and confer the University honors and degrees on the students of all the Colleges.

“3. That no College connected with the University shall confer degrees.

“4. That each College connected with the University shall be entitled to public aid from the University Fund, according to the number of its students matriculated by the University.

“5. That there shall be one University Fund, distributed to each College according to its works in imparting the education prescribed by national authority.”

Such a degree as that contemplated under this system, would bear the same value, in a national point of view, and would stamp a similar character on the graduates issuing from that institution, as a degree from Trinity College, in Ireland, from Oxford or Cambridge, in England, or from Edinburg or the other Universities, in Scotland. That being the system which the people of this country require, I believe the petitions which have been set agoing, *pro* and *con*, have been framed on both sides, so as to evade the question. It is prayed on the one hand, that aid be granted to superior education, and on the other, that no further aid be granted to denominational colleges. I believe the prayer of this latter class of petitions expresses the all but unanimous voice of the people of this country; that it is the beat of the nation's pulse which is thus conveyed to this House, and that is the reason why we have the trimming language found in the petitions that are presented on the other side. But, to come down to the practical bearings of the question—which is one, as I have said, for the Government to deal with—I certainly cannot vote against the amendment, which announces the doctrine that I have ever held on this subject. I am not one to go back on my professed principles, and I shall not now give an expression to my views contrary to what I have given in times past. I think it is matter of congratulation to this House that the honorable gentlemen who have introduced the original Resolution, should have laid down the proposition contained in that Resolution. It is a matter of congratulation that those who in times past have entertained the opinion that denominational colleges should receive State aid, and be supported out of the Public Treasury, that they are now prepared to concede that claim, and to go for a system of national university education. I am glad it should be so. I do not wish to throw it back in the teeth of the honorable member for Welland, that he may have enunciated views last year different from those he enunciates now. If he has changed his views it is a matter of congratulation to me that his views at the present time are in accord with the views and feelings of the people of this country. (Hear, hear.) I will now ask honorable gentlemen to bear with me a little, while I call their attention for a few minutes to some of the expenses of this model university, which is held up to the admiration of the people of this country. I think the returns which have been made, on the order of this House, afford a sufficient ground why the people should be roused to a sense of their own interests in this matter. They show that these lands which were granted at a very early date for the superior education of the people of this country, have been mismanaged and abused, and wrested from their original intention. The way in which this endowment was managed by King's College, every honorable gentleman must regret, and every one must feel it to be a matter of congratulation to the country that the endowment was taken away from under the control of one sect or denomination, and devoted, as was the intention at the time, to placing the institution on a broad national

basis. The matter was first taken in charge by the Hon. Robert Baldwin, in his Act of 1849, and was afterwards dealt with by Mr. Hincks, in the Act of 1853. Now I do not know that I am thoroughly acquainted with the true history of this question ; but there is something in it that very much surprises me indeed, namely : that when these colleges got that enactment, they did not avail themselves of it ; that, after Parliament had heard their case, and enacted the statute of 1853 for their benefit, they did not avail themselves of its provisions. There may be some truth in the statement that that statute was amended and passed through Parliament in the end, with an eye to the giving out of the University contract in the City of Toronto. If such were the case, it is the duty of this House, and of the Government, to see that that matter is investigated. It is said by those who are informed on this question, that in the place of the 54th clause, as it now stands, another was introduced in the draft of the Bill, as presented to Parliament, to the effect that a stated amount should be given to each of the colleges which availed themselves of the provisions of the Act. If this statement be correct, I regret exceedingly that the Bill did not pass in the shape in which it stood in the draft. Every well-wisher of his country must regret that it did not pass in that way. But it is said, and it is thrown in the teeth of the gentlemen who are now asking consideration at the hands of the people of this country, and laying their case before this House ; it is thrown in their teeth, that it was they themselves who got the change made, because they thought the surplus would be a great deal more than the amount of the fixed sum they were to receive, and that they would thus receive a great deal more from the public chest. There are one or two items in these returns of University expenditure to which I must now refer. It has been said by Lord Dundreary, that there are some things which nobody can understand ; and if there is one thing more than another which no one can understand, I think it must be the return of expenditure which we get from such an institution as University College. I find that in the year 1867, the item of "incidents" amount to the nice little sum of \$1,620.72. The little item of "stationery" is also a singular one. I think they must surely buy their stationery for the University in some small retail establishment, in the back streets of the City of Toronto, because I cannot conceive that, with any prudent management of the Institution, so large a value of stationery could be consumed in one year. In 1867, for the simple matter of stationery, \$2,333 were taken out of that endowment. (Hear, hear.) I ask whether that is not a large sum for those gentlemen to squander for such a purpose. I am not, however, so much surprised after all, when I remember the language of a gentleman, whose opinion those who support University College will not undervalue, and whose authority in such a matter they will not be likely to deny. I shall quote the language of Professor Wilson, when examined, with reference to this 54th clause, as representative of University College,

before the Parliamentary Committee of 1860—a Committee appointed when Parliament sat in Quebec, with Hon. Malcolm Cameron as Chairman, to enquire into the University question :—

“But, as for the surplus, it is for the Legislature to determine what shall be done with it. I should be delighted to see an adequate specific endowment set apart for us, in such a way, that, if we exceeded the appropriation, we should make up the difference out of our own salaries ; but, also, with the proviso, that, if we were able to retrench, we should have liberty to expend the balance in improving the efficiency of the Institution. At present, it is provided that if we save any money, it is only that thereby it may pass away forever from the funds of the Institution to which we belong.”

“We are men,” he says—and, as the hon. member for Prescott would say, subject to influences—and the influence in that case was to prevent any surplus being found.

“We are men, and that must be an unwise system to place us under which provides that the more we economize the more we lose.”

I must ask the indulgence of the House while I give another extract from the evidence taken before the Committee, but which, I believe, was never presented to the House. In his examination before the Parliamentary Committee, the Bursar of the University was asked what was the University revenue in the years from 1853 to 1859 ?—was there any surplus in each of these years—and, if so, what was done with the money ? He replies :—

“I have, by accident, a memorandum which will show in what year there was a surplus, and the amount. The memorandum is as follows :—

1853—	Balance	Income	Fund	carried	to credit	Surplus	Fund.....	\$12,148	26
1854—	“	“	“	“	“	“	13,475	72
1855—	“	“	“	“	“	“	696	99
1856—	“	“	“	“	“	“	1,370	98

Amount at credit Surplus Fund\$27,691 95

This is the Bursar's statement in reference to the surplus funds. We can hardly suppose any body of men being extravagant enough to make away with the whole of the splendid endowment appropriated to superior education in this country. But, beyond all question, the money was frittered away ; and is it not disreputable that those in charge should have to confess that they know nothing about the way in which these vast sums have been squandered ? I know nothing about the Bursar, and only take the published statement—that which is given by themselves. Here it is :—The question is put—“Where is the \$27,691.95 ?” Reply—“It is supposed to be lying in the Bank of Upper Canada, forming part of the general funds in my charge.” “What do you mean,” it was asked, “by supposed to be lying in the Bank of Upper Canada ? State the thing as it is.” “The money is in my hands, but I have had to draw upon it, and various other funds in my

hands, to meet the costs of the building." And, mark you, when the Bursar was asked where the surplus money was—he replies : that it is supposed to be lying "in the Bank of Upper Canada—forming part of the general funds in my charge." He never did what the statute plainly directed him to do, regarding these funds, but entered them in the general account. (Hear, hear.) The further question being put—"How is the money to be employed?" He says :—

"I have received no directions as to what should be done with it, except that it was to be considered as a surplus fund lying in the Bank of Upper Canada to my credit ; but in consequence of the outlay for the building, I have been obliged to overdraw on the Bank."

Now, this money belongs to the people of this country ; and, even at this late day, it is their prerogative to demand from the University Board what had been done with this money. We have a right to call on them to refund this amount. (Hear, hear.) And there is something more. We hear a good deal about centralization in Toronto ; and we see that the public journals of the city disagreeing on almost every other point, are remarkably unanimous in this. But there is a great deal of force in the objections to this centralization. Is it, let me ask, fair to the tax payers throughout the country ? For, after all, this endowment formed part of the assets of the people of the Province. This revenue has been diverted from the purposes to which it was originally devoted ; and I assert without fear of contradiction, that no system can ever be invented to set the matter right, which left the control of the institution in the hands of an irresponsible Board. (Hear, hear.) As far as the management of this fund is concerned, I contend that no effective system can be introduced except the establishment of one broad national system, which would make the Government of the day responsible for every sixpence paid out on account of University College. I would have in this House a Minister of Education to deal with the question, from the lowest Common School to the highest University ; and until we have some such system—until there has been a general consolidation, we can never have this fund properly administered. (Hear.) The public will be no longer satisfied with half measures in relation to education. If the medicine is to be effective at this stage, it must not be taken in small doses. (Hear, hear.) And I would ask the Government of the day to pause before lightly passing by this question. I would regret exceedingly there should ever be an emergency which would give rise to a public clamour for the disendowment of University College. But if we do not meet this question fairly—a question which is entertained by a large portion of the public—if the question is not dealt with by the Government of the day—then, most assuredly, it will be taken in hand by the people themselves—(hear and cheers)—for, I firmly believe, there is no "put off" to this question. There is no use in the Government of the day attempting to evade their responsibility in relation

to it. (Cheers.) For my part I would like to see in Canada an institution something like the London University—a University which could send to this House and to the Dominion Parliament, a member to take a position there as specially charged with the interests of higher education. (Hear and cheers.) Term it, if you like, an electoral college, or what you will, but let its working and power be such as I have alluded to. As for purely Denominational Colleges, I say—as has been said during this debate already, that there is no use whatever in seeking public aid for such institutions. We will never again join Church and State in this Province, or go back again and undo what we did in 1854, in the secularization of the Clergy Reserves. But while holding this view, I cannot shut my eyes to the issue lying before this House and the people of this country in dealing with the great question now before us. I would on this occasion have liked to have taken up more time in dealing with Upper Canada College in its relation to the University, but will reserve my remarks on that subject for a future occasion. That Institution has been established with a large endowment—and, as I view it, no possible defence can be made in this House, or the country, justifying the establishment of such an Institution in Toronto, at the expense of the Province at large. Every cent of the expense of maintaining and working that splendid establishment, with its staff of thirteen teachers, is taken from the public purse—and is, I maintain, wrongly taken. (Hear, hear.) The honorable gentleman, having noticed the instance cited by a previous speaker, as showing the proficiency of students of the University of Toronto—the instance in which the Gilchrist Scholarship was borne off by a student of one year—contended that that evidenced, also, the efficiency of the Grammar Schools and other educational institutions in which the fortunate winner of the Scholarship had received his previous education—went on to say :—The view I take in reference to the question before the House, is that it is not fairly put, even by the original resolution ; and, as far as the amendment is concerned, I must say that we cannot go back from the position assumed by us last session ; I should, therefore, unquestionably accept the amendment. (Hear.) But I can tell the Government that the passage of that amendment will prove no solution of the difficulty. (Cheers.) That amendment does not squarely and honestly meet the issue before us. Already we have had abundance of evidence that there is an agitation going on in the minds of the people of the country on this subject. There is no use shirking this view of the case ; and, under the circumstances, let me ask honorable gentlemen, can they for a moment believe they meet the question fairly by the amendment before us ? It may relieve honorable gentlemen from an inconvenient position at present, but the difficulty remains, and will have to be met fairly and squarely, sooner or later. (Cheers.) In conclusion, I would ask honorable gentlemen to prepare themselves for what must

inevitably arise—the agitation of this question from one end of the country to the other. (Hear, hear.) For my own part, I can only hope that that agitation will be productive of good to the legislation of this House, and tend to advance the best interests of the country. (Cheers.)

MR. CLARKE—The point of order has been decided against me, but I would desire to say a few words respecting the amendment of the honorable member for Lincoln. At the commencement of the session, honorable gentlemen are aware, I gave notice of a resolution which I intended to propose, of a character totally different from that brought forward by me to-night. I intended then to press on the House the advisability of giving temporary relief to denominational Colleges. The member for Lincoln also gave notice of an amendment to that resolution, to the effect that the House had already declared it inexpedient that public money should be paid out for this purpose, and that it would be unwise in the Legislature to grant further aid to denominational Colleges. As I stated before, at the suggestion of my friends, I considered it expedient to withdraw that resolution, and give notice of that which I now propose. The difference between the two resolutions is not hard to perceive, and the notice of the present resolution has been before the House between two and three weeks. Now, I submit that if the honorable member for Lincoln meant to deal fairly with me, he should have given notice of his amendment soon after I put my resolution on the paper. But he did not do so; and, until he proposed it in the House to-day, I was not aware of its precise terms. It was only yesterday I learned that the honorable gentleman intended to propose an amendment; but of its nature I was, as I say, unaware, until he got up in his place and moved it. Now, I maintain that it is unfair in any honorable member to propose an amendment of this character without giving notice of it. I contend that his object in moving this amendment is to avoid a direct vote on the proposition before us, and ask the House to concur in a totally different resolution. Such a course, is, I say, unfair: for if the House was disposed to deal fairly with the question, they should meet it on the issue I propose. But since the amendment is to be admitted, I hope the House will consider favorably another amendment which is to be submitted, and which honorable gentlemen will observe combines the points of both the original resolution and the amendment. I think I have already stated my own views in reference to aid in these Colleges. I have shown that I am disposed to abandon altogether the question of denominational grants; for I believe the time for such grants to have gone by, and, at the most, I was only an advocate for their temporary continuance. And now, when I make the explicit statement that I do not desire to press on the House the desirability of continuing these grants, it is unfair to avoid the real issue before us, and ask the House to pass a resolution affirming the inexpediency of continuing denominational grants. (Cheers.)

MR. BLAKE'S SPEECH.

Mr. BLAKE said—He rose with considerable satisfaction at having heard from members that there was a general disinclination to restoring the system of Denominational Grants. In February last, a discussion took place, which was different in tone, and he ventured to predict that the question—for there was a question—was not solved by the Legislation which then took place, and that the question was one of great significance. That question had now come up, and was pregnant with usefulness. Then there was some foreshadowing of what was now proposed—the continuing of the grants—because the movers of the resolution considered that the colleges were entitled to some solid aid. Miraculous to say, the two resolutions of the honorable mover of the present resolution, were brought before the House on the same day.

Mr. CLARKE—It was not before the House.

Mr. BLAKE—Yes ; both were on the orders of the day, and were called by the Speaker, when the honorable gentleman wished to withdraw one of them—the one proposing grants to colleges—or rather stating that it was expedient to continue support to the colleges. (Hear from the Attorney-General.) Now, the honorable gentleman said that it was unfair to refer to that resolution, on the ground that it was a merely temporary motion. Well, it was not a temporary motion, for it did no less than reverse the entire legislation of this House, in respect of the subject now under discussion. Why did he (Mr. Blake) now refer to this subject? It was to show the dangerous nature of the motion now before the House. The resolution affirmed the desirability of establishing a Provincial University. Why, the country already had such an University. One was already in existence. There was in the motion an abstract proposition before the House to affiliate the colleges with the University. It was a matter to be considered in two ways—as one of advisability, and as one of details. Now, if any plan was brought forward by the honorable gentleman, or the Government, he would be prepared to consider that plan ; but he could not enter upon the consideration of the two abstract resolutions the honorable gentleman had brought forward. If that was done he would be ready to consider that plan. The honorable member was prudent enough to go into details.

The honorable member for Algoma did propose a scheme. It was one proposed on a former occasion, and one he had himself discussed, and which contained a difficulty which could not be overcome.

Mr. CLARKE—What is your scheme?

Mr. BLAKE—I am discussing the honorable member's scheme. The honorable member for Algoma's scheme said that there was to be no religious teaching whatever. He had taken down the words as they were spoken, with all that impressiveness which must convince the members of this House that the honorable member spoke on behalf of some particular college.

Mr. CUMBERLAND disavowed speaking on behalf of any college. He spoke entirely the conviction of his own judgment.

Mr. BLAKE—Well, that showed the quagmire into which the House would fall if they adopted the honorable gentleman's views. The honorable gentleman now, it appeared, came forward with a complete scheme, which did not emanate from any other person or body, but simply as the result of his own views. Well, that placed the whole question in this light—that the honorable gentleman who had supported the resolution did so without having the authority or the conviction of any minds but their own individually, and this would have the effect of placing the House in the position of having to find the solution of the question for them. Now, what were the details of the scheme? It was said that it was advisable that there should be a universal curriculum of study. If that could be done it would be a good thing, but there were no means mentioned for convincing this House. The honorable member proceeded at length to criticise the details offered by Mr. Cumberland, and argued against their practicability. Last but not least came the question of aid. It was proposed that there should be a certain number of graduates to entitle colleges to affiliate.

Mr. CUMBERLAND stated that he meant to suggest that there should be a minimum fixed.

Mr. BLAKE—The proposal involved that the receipt of the State aid was dependant upon that qualification, and that would result in colleges reducing the standard of their pupils, so as to produce a given number. That was really the difficulty of the case, and it was a formidable one, which should induce the House not to devise a scheme, but rather to wait for a scheme and discuss its merits when it came. The fact was that the standard of education was the stand-point of the framers of the resolution; but he had already shown that, instead of the standard being raised, the tendency would be to lower it. He questioned very much whether this resolution was not calculated, as a first step, to accomplish the result aimed at by the first resolution, which was withdrawn, in consequence of the utter hopelessness of this House being induced to adopt it. He himself was in favor of an

amended educational scheme. (Hear.) But he must have something tangible before him. It had been said that the name of the University should be changed from "Toronto" to "Ontario," but he did not agree with that, because, as the University of Toronto, it had gained a name which many such an institution in other parts of the world might envy. At the proper time he would be prepared to propose the following amendment:—

"That this House, while firmly adhering to the view that denominational colleges should not be supported by State, and is prepared to give its best consideration to any scheme which may be laid before it for the improvement of superior education, and for the establishment and maintenance through the Provincial University of a uniform and elevated standard of education."

Mr. W. CLARKE, asked what was the difference between his resolution and that of the honorable gentleman who last spoke?

Mr. BLAKE said the difference was that his resolution affirmed the willingness of the House to consider any good scheme, but that of the honorable gentleman committed the House. (Hear.)

MR. LAUDER'S SPEECH.

Mr. LAUDER said—I am sure the House will agree with me that there is no question which has come before us, since we were called together, of so much importance, as that which now engages the attention of the House, namely, the colleges of the country, their regulation and maintenance. During last session the subject was discussed to some extent, and the present discussion was at that time foreshadowed by several honorable members who then addressed the House. The agitation which we have witnessed, as shewn by the petitions which have been presented to the House, the discussions in the public newspapers, and the views which have been announced by honorable members here to-night, was foreshadowed at that time. I was not prepared, Mr. Speaker, for the unanimity manifested on this great question to-night. By the newspapers we found the different Churches dragged into the discussion of this question—most improperly. (Hear, hear.) But here to-night, honorable gentlemen on both sides of the House—speaking upon this question, although differing on minor matters, according to the peculiar stand-points from which they are individually viewed, have taken the broad, patriotic ground that there is a grievance requiring amendment, and that we must take that grievance up. But while we have had University College, and the various grievances connected with it, discussed—while Upper Canada College has been spoken against—and while the other Colleges and the other branches of our educational system have been commented on—one feeling

was prominent, that the time had come when either the Government, or some member under their sanction, should take up this question of collegiate education. With but one exception, all felt that we were bound to deal with this question as a Legislature, on public grounds and without regard to sectional feelings and differences—and I must say I was surprised at this one exception, I mean the honorable member for Lincoln. I was astonished at the remarks of that honorable gentleman. He held up one particular denomination in the Province to ridicule for having carried on what he called a crusade against the University, and had taken advantage of the absence of a certain class of gentlemen from the floor of this House, to abuse and slander a large class of the community. He spoke of the graduates of outside Colleges in a style which he may adopt, if he likes to venture it, when he goes outside the walls of this House. At such a time he may compare graduates with graduates, and if he pleases colleges with colleges. But I can tell that honorable gentleman, when he takes his position here in the Legislature, as a public man, that he has no right to slander any particular class of the community, and holding them up as having degrees from Universities and being nevertheless uneducated. I will not use the terms which that honorable member applied to those graduates, but when he states that these outside colleges had not imparted that education and training to their graduates which would enable them to compete and take position with the graduates of other colleges and universities, he makes a statement quite unwarranted and unworthy any honorable member occupying a seat in this Chamber. (Hear, hear.) I can tell that honorable gentleman that there are hundreds in this Province to-day who have derived the greatest benefit from the training and education imparted by those institutions which he reprobated and spoke disparagingly of. And further, he may rest assured his remarks here will not go unanswered, and the honorable gentleman will find out that he has made a mistake in asserting that these gentlemen, as a class, are not to be called graduates—that they are not worthy that credit and position which their degree in those colleges gives them. (Hear.) What right had he to speak disparagingly of such colleges as Trinity, Queen's and Victoria—some of whose graduates had taken the highest honors in Britain? Of such men it is that the honorable gentleman comes here and speaks in a contemptible way—a way that does him no credit, belong to what college he may. (Hear, hear.) He may continue to talk of particular churches and denominations, and endeavor to bring them into disrepute and reprobation, but I have no doubt the honorable gentleman's constituents will require an explanation at his hand, and I will leave them to deal with him, when he goes back to them. (Hear, hear.)

I have heard it stated, Sir, that this agitation originated and has been carried on by a certain class of the community in hostility to University College; and, again, over and over, I have heard that disclaimed on the floor of

this House, and we are told, Sir, that we are seeking to put our hands in the public chest—we who are seeking a re-organization of the University and College system of the country. But I believe the truth is they are afraid to make these charges here where they can be answered, and where the sectarian cry can be dealt with on its true foundation. They are aware that some of the denominations supporting these Colleges for a quarter of a century have been known as voluntaries from the commencement. The conference of the Methodist Church in 1836-'37-'38—over and over again—passed resolutions disclaiming all interest in the Clergy Reserve endowment, on which they had a claim prior to handing over those Reserves to the Canadian Government.

Mr. McMURRICH—They have taken the money though.

Mr. LAUDER—So far from this being the case, they actually passed resolutions giving up all claims on that endowment in order to enable the Government to deal with it, and settle the question finally. The whole history of the Methodist organization, indeed, shows it to have been based on the voluntary principle. But to say that supporting a College under their control *for secular training*, and receiving a grant of public money in aid of such training, is to be associated with State aid, and characterized as a remnant of a State Church system, is simply talking from prejudice, and assuming that he proved which has not a vestige of argument to support it. Some members seem to think that because an institution is under denominational control, it is necessarily sectarian in its teachings. Teaching may be, and I hope in thousands of institutions is under the guidance and control of Christian men, and not sectarian, or the exponent of the mere creed of the teacher. Now what is the fact? Honorable gentlemen do not need to be told that it is no new thing this controlling of education by the Religious Denominations. What do we find in our Common School system? A certain class object altogether on principle, to secular teaching in our Common Schools, unless associated with religious teaching. I believe a large section of the people share that feeling, although the Legislature only sanctions the control of Common School education by one class of the community, the Roman Catholics. Their scruples had been sanctioned and recognized by the Legislature in times gone by. In other countries, too, we find that nearly all the denominations represented in this Province, control their own schools. This is the case in Britain. In Scotland, in nearly every town where a Free Church congregation is established, they have their own schools. Though having parish schools, they establish others under their control and appoint their own teachers. Of course they did not at first share in State aid, but I believe many such schools so established are now recipients of government support. In England, as I have said, the different bodies control their own schools. Wesleyans, Presbyterians, Independents, and Episcopalians—all

have their own day-schools—and will any one venture to assert that education is in the background in England? Their educational system there is neither backward nor sectarian. I am not now, Mr. Speaker, advocating the system which prevails in that land, but am instancing the educational system of Britain, as illustrating that secular teaching by denominations is not new, nor always injurious to the interests of education. (Hear, hear.) And what do we find to be the case here? Notwithstanding the establishment of University College years ago, nearly all the denominations in the Province have their own Colleges. Victoria College has been founded some 25 years and upwards; and the Church of England not only supports its own College in this city—which has been in existence for many years—but Episcopalians have established new Colleges in London and Picton. The Church of Scotland has Queen's College; the Baptists have established a College in Woodstock, and other denominations have their own colleges; all clinging to the idea that for reasons which they no doubt deem well founded their denomination should control its own College. Can we shut our eyes to this state of things?

Hon. Mr. WOOD—Who objects to it?

Mr. LAUDER.—No one objects; but an Act of Parliament, I fancy, will not have the effect of compelling the people to support one College. When we had this question under discussion before, the Hon. the Treasurer endeavored to show the relative position of the denominations of the Province regarding each other, and proved from the census tables that certain denominations were more or less numerous than others; and he also tried to prove, at the same time, that a large number of the people of this Province were favorable to secular Colleges alone, and unfavorable to denominational Colleges. But when we come to examine the statistics given on that occasion in connection with the Colleges, as we find them, we find that they do not bear out that argument. The fact is, that the vast majority of the people of the Province—through the heads of their denominations—sanction and support their own Colleges, send their children to them, and in every way maintain these institutions vigorously and well; while, on the other hand, we find University College, on which such a vast amount is expended—is attended by a mere fraction of the youth of the country seeking superior education. And yet honorable gentlemen try to persuade themselves that there must be no extension of our College system. (Hear, hear.) I was very glad to hear the member for South Bruce disclaim such an idea. Judging from what we had heard and seen before, that honorable gentlemen might have been expected to take different ground. But what does he say? He does not say that University College is perfect. He does not assert it to be pure and free from all abuse and mismanagement, nor yet that we must not interfere with it. No, but he takes the broad ground, which I hope members of the House

will follow, and which the Government itself ought to occupy. He argues that if there are abuses connected with that institution, they ought to be remedied ; that if the country declares for more than one College, that they should have them—that if a proper scheme were presented for the organization of a Provincial University with affiliated Colleges he would entertain it and discuss it. (Hear, hear.) Now, for my part I do not care how much he may object to the details given by the member for Algoma, so long as he maintains the broad principle—which I believe this Province is prepared to sustain—that if the people demand more than one College, such a demand should be listened to. (Hear, hear.) Honorable gentlemen get up in their places and tell us that one College has been established by the Government and that there shall be no more, and in fact they say there is no need of more. But not one gentleman representing a constituency outside Toronto will take up that position ; for I know the country would not sustain them. (Cheers.) You have but to mention in any rural constituency the facts connected with that one College—to show the vast sums spent in brick and mortar and stone—the manner in which the splendid endowment has been frittered away in an elaborate system of decoration, heating and other useless incidentals—to convince the people of the mismanagement attending it, and the necessity for a change. (Hear, hear.) And not only has a splendid endowment been wasted but the institution is now \$70,000 and upwards in debt. Sir, when we look back at the inception of that institution, and the mode of regulating its expenditure and management, we are astonished that any body of men such as the Senate of Toronto University, supposed to represent the intelligence of the Province, should allow any sub-committee to spend such an enormous sum of money in building up a fine monument of their extravagance and want of economy in the waste of this endowment. (Hear, hear.) I say, taking the history of this institution, there can be no pretence of any judicious careful management of the endowment ; but quite the contrary,—I care not who says differently. (Hear, hear.) I have no desire whatever to throw odium on any particular individual connected with that institution. Men of great learning and ability are associated with it. They command the respect of the Province, as far as position and learning are concerned. But this Province is not prepared to endorse the action of the managers of the institution with regard to the fund committed to their control, and you have but to refer to the Parliamentary Commission of Enquiry to find them condemned for their mismanagement. Reforms were suggested and determined on by that commission ; and now that we are as a Province controlling our own affairs, are we to shut our eyes to this state of things, and say we will do nothing? not even make enquiry, or extend, were needed, the benefits of that endowment to other sections of the Province? I ask members representing the eastern and western sections of Ontario are they prepared to take a position which will have the effect of shutting up the doors of Queen's

College? I believe that if they are, the Province will not sustain them. (Hear, hear.) The Province does not desire that those time-honored institutions, which have been doing such good work for the youth of the Province, should be shut up in this summary way. Having received aid from Government for the past 25 years, these institutions had grown up and flourished, and to cut them off from all Government support now, was neither a statesman like nor politic act. (Hear, hear.) You may change their management and remove everything which could be considered sectarian before giving aid, but do not destroy them. Would it not be better, in order to give the people of the Province time to mature and introduce a scheme to meet the views of the members of the Government, and of the member for South Bruce, who was the leader of a certain section of the House, and spoke for that section—

Mr. BLAKE—I am not the leader—I never was the leader of any section—and I spoke for myself only.

Mr. LAUDER—Of course I am bound to accept the honorable gentleman's statement—and I am glad to receive even his own opinion. But I venture to say that the view laid down by him before the House—the broad and statesman like way in which he suggests he is ready to meet this College difficulty—is one which will meet the support of the House and the Province at large. True, as I said, he does not agree with the member for Algoma in some of the details. Neither do I, and others also object to some of these details. But when leading members of this House take the position that this question must be dealt with, and press on the Government the necessity of taking up a question like this, we have reached a point we desire to bring members to—viz: that the question must be dealt with—(cheers)—and though it may be thrown over for the session, it cannot be burked, checked, nor buried—that it will spring up constantly until a satisfactory solution has been arrived at. (Hear, hear.) Before sitting down I would like to say that I have always objected, ever since I knew anything of the bearing of the question on our Colleges—to the system of annual grants. (Hear.) It is wrong in principle and injurious in practice, that Colleges should be obliged to come here from year to year to apply for grants. In no other country in the world is such a system in existence. This thing should be put on a Legislative basis—should be regulated by public enactment—and in such a course the great majority of the people of the Province would concur. Members may tell us that by advocating this we are raising the old question of hostility to University College, and even charges us with bringing back a repetition of the scenes when Upper and Lower Canada were arrayed against each other. They tell us, you are raising the old sectarian cry. But I do not fear it. I believe we are able to discuss and settle this matter without bringing back those scenes of recrimination and virulence. (Hear, hear.) Sir, I promised

on a former occasion—and I am prepared to fulfil it—that there was no class of my constituents—whatever Church they belonged to—whom I would like to see wronged. I gave my promise—and I feel it to be sacred—that if ever a minority of the people of the Province were held up to execration, I would stand by them, and on no occasion would I vote contrary to their rights and privileges, as citizens. (Hear, hear.) With regard to the course of the Attorney General in this matter, I must admit that since I have taken my place on the floor of this House, on many occasions I have been glad to be able to support him. On more than one occasion I was pleased to see the stand he took, and the economy which he manifested in conducting the public business of the Province. But I must admit that on the question before the House I am astonished at the way in which he shuts his eyes and says that we must do nothing—(hear, hear)—that there may be ever so much petition and discussion, but we are to have nothing to do with it—that it is a question of old sectarian cries and of old parties, and we must not interfere. I sincerely hope he will re-consider that position, and that the Government will not allow this question to be disposed of without giving some indication of the interest taken in it—(hear, hear)—and that they will tell us that they are prepared to take it up and deal with it as a Government. This is not a question for a private member to take up and propound a theory upon, in the way asked. They say, what is your scheme. Now I submit that it is not the most desirable course for private members to undertake any such scheme. It is not for any private member to plan the details of a scheme of such magnitude. It must be taken hold of and dealt with by the Government. But they say, if we make any change in the direction indicated, there will be no end of these educational institutions, and one College is enough—we do not care how well secular training has been done in any of the Colleges—we will not recognize you in any way—we give you one College, and we will not condescend to investigate the affairs of even that institution although it is under our own control, and although this House is responsible to the country for its management. This is their language. Although they have on their official files a report directing enquiry into the management of this institution in this city, they say we will have nothing to do with it—we will not interfere—we will shut our eyes to it altogether. Perhaps this position is one satisfactory to the Government. But I can tell those honorable gentlemen that it is not a position which will meet the approbation of the people of this Province, and I hope the Government will reconsider the matter, and at least foreshadow some action in the future with reference to these Colleges. Before taking my seat, there is one other point to which I wish to allude, and that is, that this is not a party question. We were not a little surprised to hear that the chairman of a very respectable gathering which took place in this city some months ago,—a man, who, above all others, we expected to be hostile (the chairman of the con-

vention of 1867)—that he had headed a long petition in favor of *grants pure and simple on the old basis* to these colleges. (Hear, hear.) That position, Sir, I do not take, and I should be sorry to take. But I mention the circumstance to show how wide spread is the feeling—that men of all parties are interested in the movement. In the past, not only have Reform and Conservative Governments supported these grants to colleges, but in this city and elsewhere gentlemen belonging to different shades of political life, have all declared that something must be done with reference to this question. We are pleased, too, that it does not assume a party phase in this House. There are, I know, men so biased by old courses and party alliances that they are led in a way I do not like to characterize; but I have been pleased to see in this discussion an amount of independence which I was not prepared for; and I hope that honorable gentlemen here, representing as they do, large numbers of their constituents who feel deeply on this question—will say now that we shall have a properly organized system, the details of which shall be settled and arranged by public enactment. Let us satisfy the country by taking up the subject in detail, as suggested by the amendment of the honorable member for South Bruce. That is, honorable gentlemen may rest assured, the only sound ground to take. And any gentleman in the Province holding this opinion, who will come forward and take up the question manfully, and settle it, will deserve the thanks of the whole community—(cheers)—as we will then have got rid of these difficulties, and buried this last source of strife and contention, and will be done with it. I have no sympathy, Sir, with the cry about sectarian grants. It gives this question an odium it does not deserve. I hope sincerely the Government will be induced to apply some remedy to allay the widespread dissatisfaction at present existing in the country in reference to this matter. (Cheers.)

DR. MCGILL'S SPEECH.

Dr. MCGILL said—After comment on remarks of previous speakers continued as follows:—The subject before the house, sir, has assumed many different phases. We have had an original resolution and then an amendment to that resolution, and are threatened with another amendment. (Hear.) In the discussion it has been acknowledged that we have a Provincial national University. That ought to be distinctly and clearly understood. But if we were to be governed by the letter of the resolution before the House, and if we were at liberty to draw from it its legitimate inference, we would infer that we have not any Provincial University, and, further, that we would have to go to work and destroy that which I term our Provincial University. First, we ask to go to work to tear down this Provincial University—and then to build it up. That seems to me a singular way of mending matters. We have this University. Confessedly it is a credit to its founders, no matter who they were, or what country they were from; and not only is it a credit to its founders, but is the delight and beauty of this city, and the glory of the Province. I say, sir, we ought to be proud of it—not alone on account of its exterior beauty, but because of its adaptability to the end for which it is designed. Having this University, what I would ask, is the sense of this cry about a Provincial University. I see no sense in it. And not only have we this University, but all the Colleges have the privilege of affiliation with it. That they have not availed themselves of that privilege is plain to all, and the reason why, we have been told over and over again to-night. But no reason satisfactory to me, at least, why this affiliation has not taken place. It has been said that it was because the Colleges found they were not going to receive as much from affiliation as they expected. But there were other reasons, and in order that the matter may stand out in bold relief before all, I will allude to them before I conclude. Within the past few days I have had an opportunity of hearing, seeing and feeling that the old suspicion still lurks in the bosoms of many in regard to this University. It is still spoken of by them as the godless University. A few days ago, a person of high respectability, who ought to understand all about it, said to me, in a quiet way,—“Is it not a pity that our young men should be obliged to inhale for so long a time such an unwholesome spiritual atmosphere as is there”—in the University. I was very much pained to hear the remark. But I am satisfied, regarding that institution, that the same

feeling pervades the bosoms of a great many individuals, with regard to the moral character of the University; and if that feeling is prevalent, I feel just as certain of another point, and that is, that that feeling is sought to be perpetuated, and is widely circulated to injure the University. Taking this view I hold that the bounden duty of every fair and honorable friend to the University, should be to examine such a charge. Let us look at it for a moment. What does it mean? What do we find in regard to the University? That it has within it men of the highest respectability, talent and learning, is never doubted. Their morality, who doubts? Their religious character who doubts? I am credibly informed that all the gentlemen composing the faculty are members of some religious community or other,—and that all who attend the University—all the young men resident in it—are regular attendants on religious duties, and that sedulous attention is paid to the moral conduct and learning of the young men; and, in fine, in no case have I been able to find any truth in the insinuation against this University. (Hear, hear.) I was sorry during the debate to hear it so often insisted upon that Toronto ought not to be a point of centralization. Now, there must be some point of centralization in the Province, and can any hon. gentleman point to one more fitting than the City of Toronto—the capital of the Province—and in every way favorably situated for being a point of centralization. What is the meaning of decentralization? Simply, that a great many of the sources of information, entertainment and improvement, that we always look for in every country at some particular point, should be scattered and divided over a number of places. But such a policy, in the case before us, would inevitably be a great mistake. And if Toronto is a point of centralization, one central institution ought to be here. I do not say it is the point where all the Colleges ought to centre—though even in that case it might be better, as if you dilute this thing too much, its usefulness must be impaired. Again, it was urged these Colleges could not affiliate with Toronto University, because it was a nest of extravagance, and by affiliating, they would only recognise and endorse that extravagance. I have been shown a long array of expenditure in bricks, mortar, &c., and have been asked to believe that expenditure to have been a reason why affiliation has not taken place. I was sorry, sir, to hear that argument brought up, and put in a way so prejudicial to the interests of the University. From information which I have, I believe there has been a good deal of extravagance of that kind; but that is all past and gone; and I say, let by-gones be by-gones. I am satisfied that at present the expenditure of University College is prudent and well managed. These, sir, are the reasons offered, accounting for the want of affiliation, but I contend they are not reasons which ought to be entertained. Of course, in the excitement now going on, there has been a system of affiliation proposed, and some of the speakers on this subject have

been at a great loss to discover a system of affiliation. But I was made acquainted with a system of this kind in contemplation by some of these parties. It is, that there shall be affiliation—as the member for Algoma has termed it—on conditions; and the conditions are these: That a certain denomination shall subscribe, say \$100,000, which they shall put into the hands of the Government—and Government is to be asked to guarantee the interest arising from this deposit, about \$6,000 or \$8,000. They give the Government a certain sum as a guarantee for their continued existence and Government gives them an equivalent. That is the scheme proposed. But I say it is worse than before. Instead of being satisfied with the old grant, they now come forward boldly and ask a larger amount, and they ask that that amount shall be made permanent; and, to crown all, they are to ask all this without giving up their denominational character. Now, notice the position in which this plan places matters. There are very few denominations in the Province which could raise the amount I have mentioned. I doubt, indeed, if more than one could raise it. The smaller denominations will certainly not be able to raise it. Many of them could not raise more than \$20,000, \$30,000 or \$50,000. Many would be unable to raise any; many, unwilling. Thus all parties not coming up to a standard made sufficiently high, would find themselves shut out, and the smaller denominations would be all effectually excluded. And, in fact, if this principle were to be acted upon, we would be only helping those who were in every way able to help themselves. (Hear, and cheers.) This scheme, I am informed, has received a good deal of attention, and subscriptions have been raised to carry it out, or some similar one. But I appeal to the House to know if this is a scheme which can meet the difficulty. It will not do away with the odiousness attached to denominational grants. It will not in any way solve the problem before us. (Hear, hear.) I now desire to address myself to another point. I will make a statement or two, which will seem astounding; and in doing so, no doubt I will be cried down as unorthodox. In order to approach my subject, I want to say that we have in Ontario now, besides University College, six graduating bodies and five non-graduating bodies, besides eight colleges; and I maintain that that is a much larger number than we require. (Hear.) Now the astounding statement I am going to make is this, that if these six graduating bodies were blotted out of existence, as graduating bodies, mind you—it would be a great boon to the cause of higher education. I do not, Mr. Speaker, say this from party or personal feeling. I disclaim every particle of anything like it. But as one who has given the subject close consideration for some time past, I have arrived at the conclusion that it would be a decided advancement of the cause of higher education, if these six graduating bodies—as graduating bodies—were blotted out of existence. (Hear, hear.) Let them all be transformed into good high schools, and they would be of incom-

parably more public benefit than at present. The five other non-graduating bodies, who are not clamoring for aid, are, I will take it upon me to say, doing as much good as those who have come before us. I come to this conclusion, because on examining and taking full information in regard to the capacity of the University and of University College, I find there sufficient capacity in every respect, whether as to room, the Faculty, or any other particular, to meet the requirements of all who desire to be taught at present in the higher branches of university education. (Hear, hear.) I am told on good authority that this university is able to accommodate from 800 to 1,000 students. Tell me that that is not ample for all the students in these six graduating bodies! Going east, we find that the University of Kingston graduates about ten, Victoria College about ten, Trinity about the same number, and the University about twenty every year; and if the University can accommodate the number I have referred to, is it not far more than is needed? And not only is this the case, but in the event of the students all coming hither, they would receive their education under much more favorable advantages than at present. (Hear.) This, Sir, is my opinion, and I am willing to take all the responsibility of it. I charge upon the multiplication of these colleges a great deal of mischief, in various ways. First, it does a great deal of harm to University College. If that institution had not had to contend with all that it has had to contend with in this way, it would have been in a very different position to-day, and would have been beyond the cry of suspicion—would have been above the envious feelings which so seriously interfere with it. It is marvellous, in my estimation, that, under the circumstances, it has been enabled to bring within its walls so many respectable young men as it has done. A counter interest works all over the country, and says, “Do not touch that Godless University.” Is it not marvellous that in the face of a stigma of this kind the University gradually increases? (Hear.) I charge further upon the multiplication of these colleges, that it is doing a positive injury in the way of lowering the standard of higher education. That is the legitimate tendency which always follows an undue multiplication of such institutions in any country. I charge also another evil on this undue multiplication of colleges, and that is the precipitating or inducing a larger number of young men to run after a higher education. It may seem paradoxical, but I state it as my conviction that we have too many young men in our country running after higher education—trying to get “B. A.” and “M. A.” fixed to their names;—adopting this course notwithstanding the more matter-of-fact, stern realities of life. They spend time and means in this way, and leave undeveloped the real material interests of their own persons and the country. What is the consequence? We are not improved in any sense by it. Physically, we are far from being improved. Our young men of the present day will not favorably compare with those of twenty-five years past. And that is not all: but this running after higher education,

where it is not really needed, leads many young men into idleness. They would all be teachers, clergymen, doctors, lawyers, or clerks; and the fact is that, if this state of things goes on, while the material interests of the country remain undeveloped, we must be lost men directly. What we have really to decide is whether there is any necessity for another University College. I take it for granted that the law provides that when the necessity arises there may be more than one University College. And, assuming there is a necessity for another University, I say let it be established. But let it be established in the right way—not as a Denominational College, but one under the Control of the Government, let it be established in Cobourg, Kingston or elsewhere. But my candid opinion is that for 50 years to come there will not be any need for such an institution; and that if we had the high schools I have referred to, and our common schools and grammar schools, I am sure we would be as well educated a country as is under the sun, England has been referred to, during this debate, with her great number of Colleges; but I take it upon me to say that if England had not so many Colleges—if she had not so many high seminaries—and if she paid more attention to common school education, her people would be better educated, with all her Colleges—with 13 affiliated round one University and 17 round another,—it is astounding to find that they have the merest handful of students; and though having all these Colleges, England is by no means the educated country that she ought to be. Considering her age and wealth and the amount she expends in education, she is far below the standard she ought to have attained. Still, I trust that with us, whenever the time comes that more than one University College will be needed, the Government will see the propriety of establishing more. I would not hurt a hair of the head of one of these institutions. But now is the time to stop it. Never again will occur a time when it can be so easily stopped as now. The Government of the day are responsible if they allow this opportune time to pass away. A great deal of the ill feeling now pervading the country regarding this subject is, of course, due to the proportions it assumed in consequence of our connection with Lower Canada. The system never would have attained its present dimensions but for our connection with Lower Canada. The members from which section used to vote for denominational grants in Upper Canada in order that appropriations to Lower Canada should also be carried. I feel proud, Mr. Speaker, that I can point to a Government which has had the power to grapple with this thing—to beard the lion in his den—which we never had a Government with the courage to do before. Let them but stick to it, and maintain the position they have taken now, and all will be well. Ontario shall be redeemed from the last semblance of Church and State, and by the time we wind up our session here we will be able to hear the last knell of its expiry over the land. (Laughter.) I do

not want to have re-enacted here, in beautiful, young, prosperous Ontario, scenes that have passed away. I do not want that Church and Stateism, pure and simple, should be imposed on us. I am sure you recollect that once before, when Church and Stateism, pure and simple, was attempted to be palmed off in Canada, the people rose in their strength and stamped it out. (Hear, hear.) For my own part, I must disclaim any personal feeling in this matter. I have taken the broad view of it, that now and forever this vexed question should be settled. I am satisfied that the very denomination now asking for these grants will hereafter regard it as the happiest day in all their history that their request had been refused. Government will be sustained by the country in the stand they have taken. They have nothing to do but sustain themselves. Further, if we concede this now asked of us, we must concede it to every denomination in Ontario; and, if we do concede it, I am prepared to bring in a resolution that in the opinion of this House it is just and right to give to every religious denomination in Ontario, according to numbers, a certain amount of money to be spent as they think fit for purposes of higher education. That is, undoubtedly the legitimate end of the present agitation. If the larger denomination is entitled to consideration in this way, why not the smaller ones? (Cheers.)

Mr. CUMBERLAND.—In referring to the amendment last put before the House, I think I may say, however, the language may be frittered away, that the intent of the Act was to recognise the Toronto University as a central university. The Act 16 Vic., cap. 89, has for its object the establishment of a Provincial University and the affiliation of colleges therewith. That is the reading I put on it; and therefore I entirely repudiate the notion, so far as I am concerned, of intending any other than the existing University of Toronto, as the future central university. With regard to the amendment of the hon. member for Lincoln, it is scarcely generous, even if we may not doubt its justice—because it puts hon. gentlemen in a false position. Consistently with the legislation of last session, I might support this amendment, while concurring in the original resolutions. (Hear, hear.) Therefore I say my hon. friend takes an ungenerous action in making his resolution substantive in its declaration, if he did so in order—though I would not prefer so to judge him—that we should be found actually voting against that which we ourselves have professed. The amendment introduced by the member for South Bruce, far from doing that, merges the two. It respects the declaration regarding non-denominational institutions, which I declared I would support; and it expresses the willingness of the House to take the whole question into calm and deliberate consideration, which is just what we were asking for. Under these circumstances, I would suggest to the member for Grenville whether it would not be wise frankly and straight-forwardly and above board—since we are all in the same boat—to accept the resolution of

the member for South Bruce, hoping that at an early day the Government will take action on the question and bring it to the notice of the House. All I can say is, that while I invite, the support of those whose opinions are with me, to the amendment of the member for South Bruce, I also express fervently the hope that now that the desire of the House is clearly that the Government should undertake the consideration of the whole question, that they will deal with it. If they do not do so, then I will take early occasion next session to give notice of action on this subject. (Cheers).

Mr. SWINARTON—I am not going to make a speech, but rise to say that I believed, like many members of the House, that when we rose last Session the Government had fixed on as their policy, that there were to be no more grants to sectarian colleges. I came back to sustain the Government in that stand; and now, during this debate, I have heard a great deal from gentlemen on both sides of the House on this college question, and yet scarcely one of them gave their views at all. (Laughter.) They went over a lot of statements which scarcely any person understood. (Laughter.) You have been talking about superior education all night; but I would like to know whether any hon. gentleman advocated common school education or not.—(Loud Laughter.) I hope the Government will stick to their views of last Session, and I think the House will sustain them. A great many petitions have been sent in here in favor of superior education, but if I know anything of my constituents, I know that the large majority of them are favorable to sustaining the Government view of the question. (Hear, hear.) I am very much surprised at the member for Algoma taking up the time of the House to-day for four or five hours in speaking of superior education. It would look better if the hon. gentleman would ask the Government to establish three or four common schools in the district of Algoma. (Loud laughter.) I think that the inhabitants of Algoma would be better satisfied if their member procured for them three school teachers, than with his making all this clamor about superior education. (Laughter.) Let us first of all see the people in our rural districts better provided with common school education. For my part I endorse the views of the member for South Bruce on this question, and, I must add, that I think that on the whole we cut a sorry figure here to-night. We have been sitting for hours listening to members who seek to make us swerve from the course we adopted last Session. I am satisfied hon. gentlemen in the ranks of the opposition (who support the Government on this question) must have been amused to see so many on our side of the House acting in this way.

Mr. BLAKE—My amendment, I understood, could not be formally placed before the House until we had first disposed of part of the proposition of the member for Welland; but the Attorney General informs me that the practice in our House, in this respect, is not that laid down by May. I, therefore, place the amendment in your hands at once.

Mr. SINCLAIR rose, amid cries of "question," and said—I do not consider that the House should bring this discussion to a conclusion without allowing every member who desires to speak an opportunity to be heard. (Hear, hear.) I profess not to be in the same box with the member for Algoma and certain other members; and I wish that to be understood. The member for Algoma professes to be averse to sectarian grants, but speaks ominously of what may happen if religious liberty is interfered with. I think his views of religious liberty are very peculiar. (Hear, hear.) There are people of religious denominations who have suffered a good deal in the way of deprivation, but I am not aware that therefore they seek the liberty of putting their hands into the public purse. All that they want, as a general thing, is that their liberty should be let alone—that the State should give aid to neither one religious denomination nor another. (Hear.) Nor can I say that I understand the position of the member for South Bruce. At any rate, his position is such as to commend itself to the member for South Grey, and that, of itself, was rather suspicious. (Laughter.) For my part, I altogether object to the sustenance of any educational institution connected with, or under the control of, any denomination, through the aid of State money. If there is any necessity for the endowment of colleges—if University College is insufficient—it would be right for the House to take that matter under consideration. But the country requires that if they are endowed, it must be on the non-denominational basis on which the common schools are founded. If any educational institutions are required to supplement those in use, I think this House will be willing to give aid to such institutions, but they must be formed on the non-sectarian principle. Entertaining these views, Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in supporting the resolution of the member for Lincoln. (Cheers.)

Mr. GOW—I have much pleasure in seconding the amendment to the amendment. I am opposed to sectarian or denominational grants, and think that that sentiment prevails largely in this House and throughout the Province of Ontario, and the sooner the gentlemen agitating this question become aware of this fact, the better for themselves and for us. I also prefer the amendment of the member for South Bruce, inasmuch as I am prepared to consider any well defined scheme to promote, extend and protect our present system of education.

Mr. CLARKE—As the mover of the original resolutions, desired to say that these resolutions affirmed the desirability of having a more efficient system of education than that which now exists. Some gentlemen in the House who opposed them, chose to attack us on the Denominational College, but, on the matter being discussed, we disclaimed any desire to seek for these grants; and I maintain that those who think with me ought to support the resolution of the member for South Bruce. If the House affirms sub-

stantially the position taken in my resolutions, it is a matter of very little consideration at whose instance such affirmation be made. I have, therefore, no objection to the resolution of the member for South Bruce. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. RYKERT—I think the member for South Bruce gives gentlemen in favor of sectarian education an opportunity of creeping out of their former resolution. But they will find a notice in the paper of a resolution which will bring them to the test before the session is over. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. FERGUSON.—I would like to ask what is the difference between the amendment and the original resolution. The mover of the original resolution declares them to be one and the same thing, and that he is willing to go for them. All the change, it appears to me is in the one word “graduation,” at the close of the amendment, which is substituted for “education” in the original resolution. I ask therefore if the last amendment is in order?

The Speaker ruled that it was.

The amendment of the member for South Bruce was then put and carried (amidst applause) on the following division :

Yeas.—Messieurs Barber, Baxter, Beatty, Blake, Boulter, Boyd, Cameron, Carling, Carnegie, Clarke, Clemens, Cockburn, Colquhoun, Cook, Coyne, Craig (Glengarry), Crosby, Cumberland, Currie, Evans, Eyre, Finlayson, Fitzsimmons, Gibbons, Gow, Graham (Hastings), Grahame (York), Greely, Hays, Hooper, Lauder, Lount, Lyon, Macdonald, Matchett, McDougall, McGill, McKellar, McLeod, McMurrich, Pardee, Paxton, Perry, Read, Richards, Sexton, Shaw, Sinclair, Smith (Kent), Smith (Middlesex), Supple, Swinarton, Trow, Wigle, Williams (Durham), Williams (Hamilton), Wilson, and Wood.—58.

Nays.—Messieurs Calvin, Craig (Russell), Ferguson, Luton, Monteith, McCall (Norfolk), McColl (Elgin), Rykert, Scott (Grey), Secord, Springer, and Tett.—12.

Mr Rykert's amendment to the amendment, was then put and carried, on the following division :—

Yeas.—Messieurs Barber, Baxter, Beatty, Blake, Boulter, Boyd, Cameron, Carling, Carnegie, Clarke, Clemens, Cockburn, Colquhoun, Cook, Coyne, Craig (Glengarry), Crosby, Cumberland, Currie, Evans, Eyre, Finlayson, Fitzsimmons, Gibbons, Gow, Graham, (Hastings), Grahame (York), Greely, Hays, Hooper, Lauder, Lount, Lyon, Macdonald, Matchett, McDougall, McGill, McKellar, McLeod, McMurrich, Pardee, Paxton, Perry, Read, Richards, Sexton, Shaw, Sinclair, Smith (Kent), Smith (Middlesex), Springer,

Supple, Swinarton, Trow, Wigle, Williams (Durham), Williams (Hamilton), Wilson, and Wood.—59.

Nays:—Messieurs Calvin, Craig (Russell), Ferguson, Fraser, Luton, Monteith, McCall (Norfolk), McColl (Elgin), Rykert, Scott (Grey), Secord, and Tett.—12.

ATTORNEY GENERAL MACDONALD rose before the original motion was put and said—It is with high satisfaction I have noticed that the House has affirmed that policy which we placed on the statute and which was among the very first acts submitted by the Administration to the House last Session. (Cheers.) We have been handsomely sustained; and I have only to say that we still adhere to the policy of last year. The Government preferred on this occasion to take no part in the debates of the House. Hon. members took up the cudgels for us so well that we gladly availed ourselves of their arguments. I have nothing more to say than to thank the House for the handsome measure of approval they have accorded us. (Cheers.)

Mr. FERGUSON—It might be inferred from the remarks of the Attorney-General that those voting against the amendment of the member for South Bruce, voted against the policy of the Government last January, by which they declared against sectarian grants. Now, I for one, am as strongly opposed to these grants, and I claim the right to say for myself and others that in voting against the resolution, we are as strongly opposed to sectarian grants as any of the gentlemen opposite. I opposed these grants when it were almost a crime to oppose them. I did it on the principle that all denominations should be equal—that while great institutions received their dole from the public, the small ones should not be neglected.

A few other members having explained their vote on the question, the House divided on the original resolution, as amended—which was carried on the following division:—

Yeas:—Messieurs Barber, Baxter, Beatty, Blake, Boulter, Boyd, Calvin, Cameron, Carling, Carnegie, Clarke, Clemens, Cockburn, Colquhoun, Cook, Coyne, Craig (Glengarry), Craig (Russell), Crosby, Cumberland, Currie, Evans, Eyre, Finlayson, Fitzsimmons, Fraser, Gibbons, Gow, Graham, (Hastings), Grahame (York), Greely, Hays, Hooper, Lauder, Lount, Luton, Lyon, Macdonald, Matchett, Monteith, McDougall, McGill, McKellar, McLeod, McMurrich, Pardee, Paxton, Perry, Read, Richards, Rykert, Scott, (Grey), Sexton, Shaw, Sinclair, Smith (Kent), Smith (Middlesex), Springer, Supple, Swinarton, Trow, Wigle, Williams (Durham), Williams (Hamilton), Wilson, and Wood—66.

Nays.—Messieurs Ferguson, McCall (Norfolk), McColl (Elgin), and Secord—4.

The House then adjourned.

